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ABSTRACT
This study investigates developing the psychosocial safety climate in manufacturing companies in Sweden, by offering insights into following questions: How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate? & How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate? The study employed a qualitative research strategy, specifically a case study, which included various interviews. The study investigated three different departments consisting of office-based personnel. The topics emphasized in this study are psychosocial hazards, psychosocial safety climate, and the factors that help in developing the psychosocial safety climate. Moreover, the topic of leadership in relation to developing psychosocial safety climate, and change management as a tool that may help in developing psychosocial safety climate were also highlighted. The study concluded that: leadership & management is the key factor in promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate, since it impacts other factors investigated in the study, supportive policies, effective communication, work design, training & awareness, and support, resources & employee participation. Moreover, while viewing the development of psychosocial safety climate as a change, three phases with unique activities in each are essential to achieve the goal of a positive psychosocial safety climate. The phases investigated are planning, implementing and reinforcing.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of the research conducted to provide a synopsis of the compromised aspects. This section provides background information, establishes the research problem or question, presents the purpose, and discusses the study's delimitations.

1.1 Background

According to the EU Commission (2021), half of the European employees consider stress prevalent in their workplace, accounting for nearly 50% of all missed work days. Moreover, the most significant cause of the European's overall health concerns and early death is mental health problems and stress-related disorders (Leka et al., 2010). ILO (n.d) claims that ensuring workers are free from psychological and physical harm is fundamental to achieving good working conditions. Therefore, the occupational safety and Health (OSH) laws are critical in ensuring the safety and well-being of the EU's 170 million workers. These regulations have helped lower workplace health hazards and developed the OSH standards throughout the EU and its various industries. Protecting workers' health and safety is also a critical component of the EU economy that serves the people (EU Commission, 2021).

Furthermore, the EU Commission (2021) highlights that the European Pillar of Social Rights recognizes that the right to a healthy and safe work environment is a fundamental principle and is essential for achieving the United Nations' sustainable development goals. Schulte et al. (2022) agree that a safe and healthy work environment is required for a healthy and productive workforce. EU Commission (2021) also states that the European Pillar of Social Rights action plan introduced a 2021-2027 OSH framework to enhance workers' health and safety in the post-pandemic world. This framework outlines the key priorities and actions necessary to improve workers' well-being and evolve the traditional workplace environment.

Regarding the psychosocial legislative framework in Sweden, the Swedish Work Environment Authority introduced AFS 2015:4 regulations about OSA (Organisatorisk och social arbetsmiljö), an abbreviation for the Swedish phrase organizational and social work environment. These regulations aim to prevent mental health and accidents in the workplace and promote a positive work environment (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2016). The Swedish Work Environment Authority implemented an OSA project from 2018 to 2022, focusing on inspecting government agencies, municipal services, security companies, private healthcare providers, and private companies. The OSA project investigates whether the employers are working systematically according to the OSA regulations. The OSA project results showed that the employers were working in a reactive rather than a proactive approach. Therefore, employers should be responsible for proactively preventing and maintaining a positive psychosocial and physical work environment (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2022). According to Tawfik et al. (2022), leadership is significant in workers' engagement, well-being, and healthcare. Mullen & Kelloway (2011) consider that poor leadership is a factor that contributes to negative impacts on employees, such as stress, sick leave, increased anxiety, burnout, and
depression. On the other hand, practical and strong leadership has a positive impact on employee-being and health.

Llorens et al. (2019) define psychosocial hazards (PSH) as the psychological and social factors in the workplace that can negatively impact employees' well-being and safety, such as stress, harassment, bullying, lack of support and recognition, and poor working conditions. Decision makers at organizations faces the challenge of addressing these risks to create healthy and safe work environments while balancing the needs of businesses and the economy. Furthermore, Hupke (2022) highlights that work-related stress and psychosocial hazards significantly affect individuals' well-being, organizations, and national economics. These risks result in adverse physical, psychological, and social effects, such as depression, stress, or burnout. Ruiz et al., 2021 highlight that PSH should be effectively managed because they are organizations’ and managers’ new unique challenges. Tagoe & Amponsah-Tawiah (2019) argue that psychosocial safety climate PSC is essential to manage psychosocial hazards in the workplace. PSC is a specific aspect of organizational climate that indicates how employees perceive the organizations’ policies, procedures, and practices that prevent workplace well-being and mental health (Fattori et al., 2022).

1.1.1 Research gap

There is limited research that simultaneously addresses psychosocial safety and change management. Studies such as Palumbo et al. (2022) do explore this connection and focus on investigating how organizational change contributes to psychosocial uncertainty or how the psychosocial safety aspects should be handled during periods of change. This research will take a different approach. In this report, developing psychosocial safety is considered a change, and change management is considered a tool to develop psychosocial safety in the workplace. Accordingly, implementing change management practices is expected to contribute to achieving the goal of psychosocial safety/ improved psychosocial safety. There is minimal existing literature on the described approach, which means there is a lack of research, a research gap, in this area. One aim is to fill that gap by considering the development of psychosocial safety as a change process and exploring the role of change management in facilitating its improvement.

1.2 Aim and research questions

The study aims to investigate the psychosocial safety climate in a manufacturing organization in Sweden. Identifying the critical factors to develop the psychosocial safety climate can provide insights into how managers can work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate, hence achieving the goal of a well-functioning psychosocial work climate. It also aims to fill the research gap by considering the development of psychosocial safety climate as a change and viewing how change management may help develop it. The aim leads to the following research questions:

- How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate?
- How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate?
1.3 Delimitations

This study is delimited to examine how manufacturing organizations in Sweden internally work to develop the psychosocial safety climate. One company with three departments consisting of office-based personnel in the case company will participate in developing the empirical findings.
2. METHODOLOGY

The following chapter presents the methodology used to conduct this study. First, the research method is explained, followed by the research process. Additionally, the chapter describes the method of conducting the literature review, collecting the empirical findings, and executing the data analysis. Finally, credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are discussed to evaluate the quality of the study.

2.1 Research method

The study aims to answer the research questions: How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate? Moreover, How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate? A qualitative research approach was used in this study, and it was appropriate due to the formulation of the research questions that start with “how.” This approach is used to gain a deeper understanding of the chosen topic, meaning to understand its whole picture and the underlying factors that are significant for the chosen topic (Bell et al., 2022; Patton, 2014).

This study employed an approach where the theoretical framework and the empirical findings navigate each other. The authors started by reading about the topic, and after that, the first interview was conducted. Following that, the study proceeded to formulate the theoretical framework to enhance understanding of the topic before further collecting empirical data. When the theoretical framework was almost done, the remaining interviews were conducted. After gathering the empirical data the theoretical framework was revised to align with the gathered empirical findings. In conclusion, as the work progressed, the literature influenced the author's perception of the empirical material and vice versa; this aligns with the description of the abductive research approach by Blomkvist and Hallin (2014). The abductive research approach allows for refinements and adjustments in both the theoretical framework and the empirical findings, ensuring that the data presented aligns with the study's aim and research questions (Bell et al., 2022). The authors consider this approach appropriate for the study because it deals with a complex problem without a straightforward solution.

A case study enables one to explain or explore phenomena that take place in their everyday context and is suitable to use to answer “what,” “why,” and “how” questions (Yin, 2013). Similarly, Crowe et al. (2011) state that this method is appropriate to develop an in-depth understanding of a particular issue within its real-life context and is limited to examining a single or few organizations. The research questions in this study included “how,” and the authors of this thesis aimed to develop an in-depth understanding of a particular issue within its real-life context. Therefore a case study was selected as the qualitative approach for this study. In conclusion, this research method was established, as shown in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research strategy</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>Abductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design</td>
<td>Case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Research method (own construction)*

### 2.2 Research process

Yin (2018) emphasizes that adhering to a systematic approach is crucial when undertaking a research study. The first phase of this study was *specifying a research area*. Before writing the report, a visit was made to the case company. The company supervisor conducted a presentation to present general information about the company, suggest a specific research area, and provide background on that area. Subsequently, a constructive dialogue was conducted to delimit the area for investigation. The proposed area was to examine safety culture. Safety culture in the case company includes both physical and psychosocial aspects. This study's authors decided to narrow the focus on studying the psychosocial aspect because this area was considered relatively undeveloped compared to the physical one, in which the company had focused and invested for many years.

Initially, the authors identified two research questions that were practical and business-oriented. However, the university supervisors suggested that a more academic and general approach was required. The case company supervisor was informed and acted understandingly. Thus, *the research questions were identified* by respecting the requirements of the university supervisors and the case company supervisor. The *literature review* and *empirical findings* were interdependent, with neither being complete when the other began. Instead, they evolved in tandem, shaping and informing each other throughout the research process. Furthermore, the comparison between the literature review and empirical findings provided the groundwork for the thesis' *analysis and discussion*, which led to the drawing of conclusions.

![Figure 1: Research process (own construction)](image-url)
2.3 Literature review

Since the literature review is an essential step in establishing the theoretical framework, it was one of the primary activities undertaken in the study. Search engines used were Google Scholar and the Mälardalen University library website to search for relevant scientific publications online. No limitations on the publications’ dates were made, but older publications were used, taking into account their publication date. However, the literature that has been used was according to the relevance of the topic. Search terms that were frequently used to find relevant publications were psychosocial hazards, psychosocial work environment, psychosocial safety, psychosocial safety climate, developing psychosocial safety, models to develop psychosocial safety, psychosocial safety management, leaders behaviors to develop psychosocial safety, psychosocial safety, and change management, change management, cultural change management. Additionally, physical books from previous courses, online articles from previous courses, and the backward snowballing effect were used to find relevant literature. The backward snowballing effect refers to reviewing the reference list of studies to find more relevant sources (Thomé et al., 2016). In this study, reviewing the abstracts of various sources helped determine their suitability for the study. If they appeared suitable, a full-case review was conducted. Thomé et al. (2016) recommend this way of selecting articles. The articles in this study were analyzed by highlighting the interesting parts, comparing different sources, and forming the theoretical framework.

While gathering the literature review data, a distinction between safety culture and safety climate was noticed. However, most of the research on psychosocial safety has only considered the psychosocial safety climate, and the investigation into the psychosocial safety culture was limited. There are differences between safety culture and safety climate concepts, but the psychosocial safety climate will be adopted in this study. Noor Arzahan et al. (2022) state, “Safety culture is most commonly referred to as ‘the result of individuals and groups’ beliefs, attitudes, competencies, and behavior patterns. It defines the commitment to and the style and efficiency of an organization’s safety and health. Safety climate, on the other hand, is a more superficial perspective. It has also been considered the measurement of safety culture and how the people in one’s organization perceive safety in their work environment. The difference between safety culture and safety climate is that safety culture relates to an organization’s set of values. In contrast, safety climate refers to the effect of environmental and organizational factors on these values.” (Noor Arzahan et al., 2022, p.1). While reviewing research about psychosocial safety, it was noticed that the existing research on psychosocial safety primarily emphasizes the concept of psychosocial safety climate. On the other hand, there is limited research regarding psychosocial safety culture; therefore, this study focuses on psychosocial safety climate. Conversely, change management research has primarily considered cultural change. Nevertheless, no scholarly investigation has examined organizational climate change. Namely, this report specifically focuses on developing a psychosocial safety climate. The report highlights this particular change as a cultural change. Therefore, this report’s change management theory applies to cultural changes.
2.4 Empirical findings

2.4.1 Case company

Since the case organization wishes to remain anonymous, no identifying information about them will be mentioned. However, the organization is a global manufacturing organization in Sweden. It was chosen since they have invested in and have expertise in the safety field and aim to undergo improvements to develop psychosocial safety in their organization. The case company has a long-standing history of improving the physical safety culture. The case company has a relatively large workplace with approximately 2000 employees (L1, 2023). They have a vision of zero accidents, and according to L1 (2023), only five physical accidents were reported by 2022. According to the incidents and accidents system available in the case company, 22 psychosocial risks were reported in 2022, and 6 psychosocial risks were reported until March 2023. The case company aims to improve its psychosocial work environment, among other things, due to the Swedish Work Environment Authority’s new regulations emphasizing the importance of proactively promoting a positive psychosocial work environment (L1, 2023). Three departments with office-based personnel were investigated, each working in different functions such as engineering and different support function areas. Each of the departments is relevant in terms of psychosocial safety, since department 1 was chosen due to its high level of psychosocial work environment, while departments 2 and 3 according to L1 (2023) exhibited psychosocial risks. The intentional selection of one well-functioning department and two with challenging psychosocial situations was aimed at facilitating a clear comparison to understand the underlying factors contributing to the observed differences in psychosocial outcomes for each department.

2.4.2 Research method

Various methods were employed to collect empirical data, but the primary source was interviews conducted with relevant employees at the case company. Blomkvist and Hallin (2014) emphasize that interviews offer valuable insights into how individuals reason about a specific problem, which makes it one of the most common ways to collect empirical data. The interview structure used in this study was semi-structured, in which the interviewers followed an interview guide that included questions to be addressed. In semi-structured interviews, adding questions or reformulating depending on the respondents' answers is possible (Bell et al., 2022). Semi-structured interviews are especially beneficial for qualitative research because they enable follow-up questions and open dialogue about a specific problem (Blomkvist & Hallin, 2014). For this reason, semi-structured interviews were deemed an appropriate method for this study. An interview guide (see Appendix 1 & 2) was created in line with the theoretical framework by operationalizing it and compiling relevant interview questions. The operationalization process requires identifying and using commonly used terms from the research question and theoretical framework (Blomkvist & Hallin, 2014). These terms were then translated into interview questions organized to include all relevant literature during the interview process, as Blomkvist and Hallin (2014) explained. Questions related to specific theoretical themes were grouped. Most of the questions were formulated to start with what, how, who, and which. As noted by (Bell et al., 2022), interview
questions formulated in this way are called open-ended questions and facilitate the generation of additional follow-up questions.

The first interview was conducted with the company supervisor, L1, via Microsoft Teams according to his/her wish. The interview questions (see Appendix 1) were not sent to the company supervisor in advance, most of the ethical considerations were taken into account by mentioning them orally, and the interview was done when the report had a minimal theoretical framework, so the interview questions did not cover all parts of the theoretical framework. Reflecting on the experience of the first interview, a joint decision was taken with the help of the university supervisor to stop the interview process until the theoretical framework was almost completed. Pausing the interview process temporarily allowed for a more insightful and profound understanding while gathering data and aligning it with the theoretical foundations of this study. However, it is essential to note that conducting the first interview facilitated gathering valuable theoretical information. When the theoretical framework was almost completed, new respondents were selected with the help of the company supervisor, and a revised version of the interview questions was created. The questions were sent to the respondents along with ethical considerations by email before the interviews (see Appendix 2). The face-to-face interviews were recorded using a mobile phone, while the interviews conducted via Microsoft Teams were recorded and saved within the platform. The recordings were then transcribed and structured to facilitate using them.

Eight respondents were interviewed in total. Since three departments were investigated, having a leader and a co-worker/employee from each department was important. The rest of the respondents have competence and knowledge in change management or/and work environment. See table 2 for information about the respondents, their role in the report, interview date, and duration. All eight respondents work in offices. A ninth respondent participated in the interviews. The respondent worked in production in a department where they experienced psychosocial risks such as stress. To obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the psychosocial safety climate in production, it was noticed that it is necessary to investigate various respondents and departments working in the production work environment. Consequently, this study was limited to only examining the work environment of office-based personnel, and the answers of the ninth respondent were not taken into account in this report. This limitation was due to the distinction between the work environment of office departments and production departments and the required leadership styles in each.
In addition, the data was also collected through participation in different group meetings. One meeting was a quarterly meeting attended by all department 1 employees. The quarterly meeting aimed to ensure that all employees were aware of the company’s work environment policies and procedures. Work environment and employee participation were discussed during this meeting. The second meeting was safety round meeting in which the department 1 team participated. During the safety round meeting, L1 reviewed safety round questions (see Appendix 3) with the team to conduct safety inspections, assess the knowledge of safety goals and manage serious accidents. Each member of L1’s team reported their department's status to L1 since they had reviewed the same questions with their respective groups. Furthermore, to conduct interviews and meetings, data for this study was obtained from various company documents, for instance, policy documents, different strategic documents, internal reports, internal communication documents, and incidents and accidents system documents. The incidents and accidents system documents included the process for reporting accidents and the questions used in the safety rounds (Appendix 3). During the data
collection process, documents related to the pilot OSA\(^1\), including its surveys and the results utilized in department 1, were also examined.

### 2.5 Data analysis

The transcribed data from interviews, company documents, and meetings contained much information; however, not all data directly addressed the research questions. To construct the chapter “empirical findings,” a thematic analysis was used, which according to Blomkvist and Hallin (2014), is proven effective in analyzing qualitative data. Thematic analysis implies identifying themes where the empirical material is sorted and analyzed to answer the research questions (Bell et al., 2022). Developing themes is based on patterns and similarities in the collected empirical data (Blomkvist & Hallin, 2014). The method was selected to address the research questions and compare the participants' responses. This method was chosen due to the qualitative nature of the study. Six main themes were identified: case company, psychosocial safety & psychosocial hazards, psychosocial safety climate, reviewing the department's psychosocial status, change management to develop psychosocial safety, and challenges to develop psychosocial safety. Subheadings were added to the six main themes for further clarity and better structure.

### 2.6 Method discussion

#### 2.6.1 Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability

A typical way to assess a qualitative research method is to discuss credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Bell et al., 2022). Therefore the method discussion includes the four criteria mentioned above. Moreover, ethical considerations are discussed.

*Credibility* refers to the internal validity of a study (Bell et al., 2022). Although not all articles used are peer-reviewed, a significant number of them are. Moreover, objective facts have been used to form the theoretical frame. Besides that, the study's literature was consistently reviewed, considering the perspectives of both the master thesis course participants and university supervisors throughout the process. Before the study was submitted and published, it was reviewed by the case company supervisor. Additionally, the interviews were carried out in accordance with the methodology chapter. According to Bell et al. (2022), all actions above improve credibility. The authors assert that validation from respondents, meaning giving them the option to review the transcribed data from interviews and validate it, can further increase credibility. In this study, this has not been done, which negatively impacts the credibility.

The second criterion, *transferability*, refers to the external validity of a study and indicates the degree to which the findings presented in the study can be valid in different contexts (Bell et al., 2022). The findings can be transferred to a different context because the study's conclusion broadly answers the research question. On the other hand, this study may only be

\(^1\)More information about OSA course is available in section 4.1.1.6
applicable in the office-based work environment in manufacturing companies in Sweden, which is the delimitation of this study. Furthermore, various recommendations addressed are only applicable in the case company; however, different lessons may also be learned by other organizations.

Dependability is about reliability, and reliability measures whether the same outcomes would have been demonstrated if the study had been conducted again or if temporary conditions influenced the outcomes (Bell et al., 2022). This approach entails maintaining comprehensive records of every phase of the research process, such as problem formulation, empirical data collection, selection of interview participants, etc., in an accessible manner. To ensure dependability in this study, a quite detailed description of the research method was presented and followed. Explanation for choices made during the study has been provided, such as how and why the interview participants were selected. Open and follow-up questions were asked during the interview to increase contextualization and help interpret the data more comprehensively. To further increase this study's dependability, a further clarification of the selections of examined literature could be offered.

Lastly, confirmability refers to objectivity, meaning the degree to which research findings are objective, not influenced by researcher bias or personal opinions, and can be independently verified or supported by others (Bell et al., 2022). To maintain the results objectively, the empirical data collection in this study was conducted following the theoretical framework, which in turn is developed by established frameworks and theories. Moreover, the responses provided by the respondents have been represented in the empirical section without incorporating any personal opinions or biases of the authors by rewriting the transcription and the company’s document. However, rewriting the transcription may have affected the study's confirmability negatively. The confirmability may be increased by having too many citations, but this may affect the readability negatively.

2.6.2 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are unavoidable in all research endeavors, and protecting human subjects or participants in research studies is of utmost importance (Orb et al., 2001). However, the research process can create tension between the participants' right to protect their privacy and personal information and the researchers' desire to create generalizations for the benefit of society. The basic principle of ethics is to do good and avoid causing harm, and applying ethical principles can help to prevent or minimize harm. According to the article “Ethics in Qualitative Research” by Orb et al. (2001), ethics in qualitative research can be measured by three principles; respect for people & autonomy, beneficence, and justice.

Respect for people involves recognizing their rights to receive information and be informed about the study, respecting the participants' autonomy by letting them freely decide whether or not to participate, and having the right to withdraw without any negative consequences. Honoring this principle in qualitative research requires obtaining informed consent from participants. The principle of beneficence means protecting the organization’s and the
participants’ confidentiality by not revealing their identities. It is suggested to use pseudonyms instead. Justice refers to equal sharing and fairness. Recognizing participants' vulnerability and valuing their contributions to the study is how the principle of justice is demonstrated in qualitative research studies. Applying this principle in practice means listening to the voice of vulnerable people and disadvantaged groups and acknowledging their contributions (Orb et al., 2001).

The first two principles mentioned above, respect for people & autonomy and beneficence, were addressed in this study since the participants in the interviews were informed about the purpose of the study, that participation is entirely voluntary, and that it is entirely okay to withdraw if they change their minds. Besides that, they were asked if it was okay to record the interview, and they approved. The respondents received this information by email, and the interviews were conducted after their consent. In addition, the participants were informed that no personal information nor the organization’s name would be revealed. The authors signed a confidentiality agreement to ensure that confidential information about the company remains private. It can be argued that the principle of justice was applied by interviewing both leaders and employees, specifically individuals with influence as well as those without. Moreover, this study was conducted in three departments; two had a challenging psychosocial situation. Therefore, this study listened to the voices of two employees and two leaders that experienced psychosocial risks.

Blomkvist and Hallin (2014) concur that ethics in scientific work is about following best practices and preventing harm to others, but it is also about following the norms of scientific work. Following norms of scientific work, both in oral and written formats, is important to demonstrate impartiality and make it possible for the readers or listeners to evaluate the results. It can be done by ensuring accurate and appropriate referencing of various sources and writing, allowing the reader to discern when the text has been directly quoted or referenced. Presenting someone else's work as one's own with no proper referencing may lead to plagiarism which is considered a serious violation of scientific ethics. In this thesis, the actions mentioned previously have been addressed. APA 7- referencing was used with assistance from Karolinska Institutet's Reference guide for APA 7, which provides instructions and examples for citing articles, books, journals, etc., both in the text and the reference list.
3. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter outlines the theoretical framework for this study, which draws on relevant previous research. The chapter is divided into two main sections: psychosocial safety and change management. Section 3.1 introduces the concept of psychosocial hazards (PSH) and its related aspects, such as factors contributing to PSH and the JDCS model. Then section 3.2 goes through the psychosocial safety climate (PSC), and its different aspects, such as definitions of the psychosocial safety climate and psychosocial safety, and the factors that promote a positive psychosocial safety climate. The first section ends by presenting the leadership styles and behaviors suitable for promoting a positive PSC. Section, 3.3 opens with an introduction about change management, then goes deeper into the different steps of change management: planning for change, implementing change, and reinforcing change. The book “change management” by Hallin et al. (2021) has been used to identify the key actions to take at each step of changing organizational culture.

3.1 Psychosocial Hazards (PSH)

Previously, safety management research has traditionally focused on physical safety, such as physical hazards, risks, and accidents (Naji et al., 2021). However, the significance of psychosocial safety in workplaces has garnered substantial attention from various societal actors in the last decades. Chirico et al. (2019) highlight that one of the critical emerging hazards in Occupational safety and health (OSH) is Psychosocial hazards (PSH). The authors identify OSH as legislations and laws that have been established by many of the world’s countries to prevent occupational safety and health hazards. Previously, The OSH legislation considered the physical, biological, and chemical risk factors while considering the psychosocial risk factors less. However, this aspect began to gain more attention in the 1960s since research about occupational psychology and the psychosocial work environment emerged and how the exploration of the causes and elements of the work environment affects the employees’ well-being and health (Johnson & Hall, 1996; Cox & Cheyne, 2000).

International Labour Organization (ILO) identified the PSH in 1986 as the interaction between, on one hand, management, work content and work structure, and other organizational and environmental conditions. On the other hand, employees’ needs and competencies (Leka et al., 2011). These interactions can harm the employees' health, experiences, and well-being. Cooper et al. (1996) address that psychosocial hazards may cause depression, stress syndrome, anxiety, post-traumatic, coronary heart disease, chronic fatigue, migraine, stomach ulcers, and allergies. Therefore, workplace PSH has been acknowledged as a significant challenge to ensuring occupational safety and health (Ruiz et al., 2021).

3.1.1 Factors that contribute to PSH

PSH encompasses the presence of social factors and psychological risks that impact employees’ health and well-being. Psychological risks are the psychological harms triggered
by an organization's environmental and societal conditions, work management, work economics, and work design (Houdmont & Leka, 2010). Chirico et al. (2019) define PSH as occupational hazards that affect the employee’s psychological health and their contribution to the work environment directly or indirectly. PSH relates to workplace problems such as bullying, violence, or stress (Ruiz et al., 2021). Hupke (2022) claims that psychosocial risks stem from inadequate organization, work design, management, and a detrimental work environment. The author defines the work conditions that cause the psychosocial risks as workplaces with overwhelming workloads, unclear job responsibilities or contradictory demands, limited decision-making ability, and insufficient control over job duties. Hupke (2022) emphasizes that these work conditions may include ineffective communication and lack of support from co-workers or managers, handling job insecurity and organizational change incompetently, and violence that includes sexual and psychological harassment. Recently, many studies, such as Harsini et al. (2022) and Gruiskens et al. (2023), address the psychosocial risks associated with remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic, significantly impacting employees’ well-being. The authors mention that during the COVID-19 pandemic, workers have suffered from poor mental health due to social isolation and unclear personal and work boundaries. To mitigate the risk of psychosocial events, a collaboration between stakeholders, regulators, and industry associations is crucial to address this issue (Walters, 2011).

### 3.1.2 JDCS model

Different models have been used to examine the psychosocial work environment. One model is job demand-control and social support (JDCS) by Karasek and Theorells (1990), which has been used to investigate what may reduce well-being and cause stress in the workplace. Karasek and Theorells (1990) mention that this framework identifies the relationship between the employees' job demands and how much they may control or influence their work. According to Bakker & Demerouti (2007), job demand describes the organizational, physical, or psychological work aspects that demand employee effort. While job control refers to the ability that employees have to influence and make decisions about how the work should be scheduled and performed. Social support encompasses supportive relationships, whether inside or outside the work, which offer employees informal, instrumental, and emotional support (Lee et al., 2022). Hansson et al. (2009) note that the combination of low control, high demand, and inadequate social support may increase burnout, illness, and sick leave risks, physical health issues, and psychological distress. These negative outcomes of the high job demand can be mitigated with the help of social support, which may decrease the impact on employees' well-being. Furthermore, adequate social support and job control may prevent the negative effects of job demand (Lee et al., 2022). A positive psychosocial work environment characteristics are high job control, a manageable workload, and supportive social relationships (Llorens et al., 2019).

### 3.2 Psychosocial Safety Climate (PSC)

*To understand how to develop the psychosocial safety climate, it is necessary to explore it and how it is mobilized in the literature.*
According to Dollard and Bakker (2010), the psychosocial safety climate (PSC) is defined as ‘‘policies, practices, and procedures for the protection of worker psychological health and safety’’ (Dollard & Bakker, 2010, p.2). The authors add that the psychosocial safety climate reflects the organizational systems, management commitment, and processes that prevent stress and promote safety in the workplace. According to Idris et al. (2010), a psychosocial safety climate reflects the management of the psychosocial hazards, management values, and attitudes toward employees’ mental health. Dollard et al. (2019) state that the psychosocial safety climate theory highlights that the root cause of psychosocial hazards can be traced back to the organizational climate². For instance, when managers fail to prioritize the employees’ mental health, the work environment is characterized by high demand and pressure. Dollard et al. (2019) add that promoting a positive PSC is critical in increasing job satisfaction and improving mental health. Moreover, the psychosocial safety climate is an essential factor in managing psychosocial hazards since it is the factor that reflects the management’s willingness to address and prevent stressful conditions at the workplace. Namely, the positive psychosocial safety climate will not only affect the mental health of the employees but also will trigger a more engaged and productive workforce (Dollard & Neser, 2013; Lee, & Idris, 2017). Therefore, employers should identify the significance of promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate and actively support the employees’ well-being and mental health. Byrnes et al. (2022) highlight that organizations with a poor safety climate usually lack accident reporting because safety climate directly correlates with accidents.

3.2.1 Psychosocial safety

According to Weaver et al. (2023), psychosocial safety relates to psychological and social employees’ well-being. It includes workplace conditions, which promote a work environment that encourages healthy social relationships among employees, positive mental health, and emotional well-being. Psychosocial safety includes respectful interactions, fair and reasonable workload, opportunities for participation, equitable treatment, and protection from bullying and harassment (Derdowski & Mathisen, 2023). The authors add that psychosocial safety is an essential aspect of occupational safety and health since it highlights the impact of the workplace environment on employees’ job satisfaction, mental health, and productivity. Developing psychosocial safety is essential in managing safety and critical in promoting a healthy and safe workplace.

3.2.2 PSC critical factors

According to Dollard et al. (2019) and Houdmont and Leka (2010), critical factors should be considered to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate. One factor is work design which refers to how work is structured and organized. It includes factors such as job control,

---

² “ Jorde Bloom [20] defined organizational climate as “the awareness of the organization members of the status and situation of the organization.” The organizational climate may play a crucial role in members’ behavior, levels of motivation, and organizational commitment” (Back et al., 2022, p.2).
job demands, and support; these factors should be addressed to ensure that employees have control over their work, can manage their workloads, and receive adequate support from their supervisors and colleagues. This involves evaluating the work environment, employee well-being, and job demands (Derdowski & Mathisen, 2023). According to Tagoe and Amponsah-Tawiah (2019), supportive policies and effective communication are essential in promoting a positive psychosocial climate. Supportive policies are critical in developing a psychosocial safety climate (Leitão & Greiner, 2017). Because organizations should have supportive policies to proactively prevent the employees’ mental health by providing them support and access to mental health services. Effective communication includes informal communication, such as regular team meetings, and formal communication, such as policies and procedures (Vaktskjold Hamre, 2023). Organizations that promote transparent and open communication may straightforwardly foster trust and respect in the workplace. Moreover, Idris et al. (2015) state that effective communication is essential because when employees get information about their work and what is happening in the company and hear their opinions, concerns, and ideas, they will feel more engaged in their work. The authors add that effective communication also contributes to creating a sense of belonging and community. When employees feel that they belong to a team working toward a common goal, they will feel a sense of purpose in their work and be motivated to achieve that common goal.

Houdmont and Leka (2010) emphasize that training and awareness is another essential factor in promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate. With training and awareness, the authors mean providing comprehensive training and awareness programs for the employees to enhance their understanding of psychosocial safety and enable them to address and identify potential psychosocial hazards. Training and education and increasing mental health awareness are vital for promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate, creating a more supportive workplace, and reducing stigma around mental health issues (Idris et al., 2015). These efforts may include training on conflict resolution, stress management, communication skills, and other relevant training that fosters a safe climate and well-being in the workplace. Dollard et al. (2019) mention that support and resources help employees manage work-related stress and promote well-being. These measures include flexible work arrangements, employee assistance programs, counseling services, and mental health services (Dollard et al., 2019). Furthermore, employees who feel that their opinions and concerns are valued are more likely to feel psychologically safe at work. Therefore employee participation is another essential factor because the employees should be encouraged to actively participate in formulating and implementing policies and procedures that promote a positive psychosocial safety climate (Hu et al., 2022). Employee participation includes involving the employees in risk assessments, seeking their feedback on the work environment, and engaging them in developing training and awareness programs.

---

1. *Job demand* describes the organizational, physical, or psychological work aspects that demand employee effort (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). While *job control* refers to the ability that employees have to influence and make decisions about how the work should be scheduled and performed. *Social support* encompasses supportive relationships, whether inside or outside the work, which offers employees informal, instrumental, and emotional support (Lee et al., 2022)
Leadership and management is another key factor in promoting a safe psychosocial climate since the managers are responsible for creating a safe and healthy environment (Kelloway and Barling, 2010). The authors highlight the importance of leadership in developing the psychosocial safety climate in the workplace. The authors emphasize that leaders play a vital role in creating and developing a positive work environment and supporting their employees by promoting mental health and emotional well-being. Manapragada et al. (2019) agree on leaders' role in promoting a psychosocial safety climate by promoting employee engagement and well-being. Moreover, leaders should promote a culture of trust, open communication, and respect. They should act as role models, prioritize employees' well-being, and establish policies and practices that promote positive psychosocial safety, such as mental health support programs, flexible work arrangements, and training and education on mental health (Manapragada et al., 2019).

Moreover, Gilbert & Lefebvre (2018) suggested various ways in which leaders may act to develop psychosocial safety, such as promoting open communication, providing support, and celebrating achievements. The authors add that leaders should promote open communication and create a space where employees can share their thoughts, concerns, and ideas. This may be fulfilled through individual meetings, regular team meetings, and anonymous surveys. Leaders should also support and help the employees exposed to psychosocial hazards or other personal problems, which may be done by providing needed resources, counseling access, and flexible work agreements. Moreover, leaders should celebrate and reward their team members' achievements. This will lead to a more positive work environment and boost morale. Dollard et al. (2019) suggest that leaders who are competent in recognizing and managing psychosocial hazards may contribute to developing a positive work environment and improving employees' well-being. Leaders should proactively address and identify psychosocial hazards in the workplace rather than simply react to the problems that arise.

3.2.3 Leadership styles and behaviors

There are various behaviors of leadership to promote a positive psychosocial work environment such as transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and the LXM approach that will be explained below (Lewis et al., 2012; Bass, 1999; Gilbert and Lefebvre, 2018; Zhu et al. 2023). Transformational leadership has key characteristics: vision, inspiration, empowerment, and being positive towards change (Carmeli et al., 2014). Lewis et al. (2012) agree that the transformational leadership style emphasizes creating positive transformations and changes within the organization, as well as developing and empowering the people involved by providing them with the needed resources and tools, and delegating tasks to them. Lewis et al. (2012) point out that transformational leaders prioritize the well-being and mental health of their team members and motivate them to take care of themselves as well as each other. Therefore, the authors mean that transformational leadership is the most suitable leadership style to improve psychosocial safety.

Furthermore, Bass (1999) and Bass and Riggio (2006) mention that transactional leadership behaviors are, for instance, managing the workload, organizing and recognizing work, and
**appreciating behaviors.** Gilbert and Lefebvre (2018) state that to develop psychosocial safety, it is essential to have a combination of transformational and transactional leadership styles. Bass (1999) and Gilbert and Lefebvre (2018) assert that transactional and transformational leadership are indivisible, highlighting that leaders can use both styles depending on the context. Skakon et al., (2010) viewed different studies that examine leadership styles in relation to employees’ well-being. The authors concluded two results, the first one is that there are different opinions when it comes to transactional leadership styles. Since, some studies found no connection between transactional leadership style and employees’ well-being, other studies resulted in that transactional leadership style leads to lower stress and burnout, and some others mentioned that transactional leadership style may cause job dissatisfaction. The second result is that most studies agree that transformational leadership promotes employee well-being and job satisfaction (Skakon et al., 2010). However, Densten (2005) mentions that having “visionary behavior” meaning having too much vision and ambition in the transformational leadership behaviors may trigger burnout.

Furthermore, some studies, such as Zhu et al. (2023) and Gilbert and Lefebvre (2018) mention that leader-member exchange (LXM) contributes to promoting a positive work environment and employees' well-being. According to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), LXM is a relationship-based approach that highlights the importance of the relationship quality between leaders and employees or followers. This theory suggests that leaders may create different relationships with their team members depending on mutual trust, communication, loyalty, and respect. LXM asserts that leaders who have high relationships quality, in other words having a high quality of communication, mutual trust, loyalty, and respect, have higher job satisfaction among their team members and are able to achieve the organizational goal more effectively (Graen, & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Zhu et al., 2023).

**3.3 Change management**

*In this report, the journey of change is divided into three phases, planning for change, implementing change, and reinforcing change. The following subheadings begin with an introduction to change management, followed by a description of the mentioned phases.*

**3.3.1 Introduction to change management**

“Change or die” (Hallin et al., 2021, p.13) is an expression that indicates that constantly improving and developing in organizations is necessary to survive. There has been a growth in the importance of organizational culture and change management (Price & Chahal, 2006). Change is imperative for growing organizations or organizations in competitive business environments (Hussain et al., 2016). However, implementing change is a complex process, and failure of change initiatives is commonly encountered. Change management is, therefore, crucial to attain the purpose of change initiatives and remain competitive (Price & Chahal, 2006). There are a vast number of definitions of change management in the literature. This report will use a commonly accepted definition provided by the Association of Change Management Professionals: “A deliberate set of activities that facilitate and support the success of individual and organizational change and the realization of its intended business
significant influencing external change indicating al., behind legislation, values, may environmental organization al., The present change, organization's change, fundamental cultural altering culture posits collective within Organizational organizations results” (Hallin et al., 2021, p. 17). The definition is based on the idea that change management is a structured and carefully considered approach that assists individuals and organizations in achieving the desired outcomes (Hallin et al., 2021).

Organizational culture refers to the shared beliefs, values, and behaviors among individuals within an organization and is expressed through language, stories, and myths that reflect their collective beliefs and values. (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015). Furthermore, Schein (2010) posits that culture is how people think, feel, and understand things in a certain way that is shared among a group. That, in turn, affects how they behave. Changing organizational culture is a complex task that requires work on more than just human behavior. It involves altering people's thoughts and values (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015). In organizational cultural change, being open and receptive to new values, meanings, and ideas are fundamental in achieving cultural change. Alvesson & Sveningsson (2015) argue that assuming organizational cultural homogeneity rarely holds in practice. In planning cultural change, cultural heterogeneity must be considered, meaning cultural differences within an organization's different divisions, departments, and hierarchical levels. Creating readiness for change is essential, and it can be encouraged by recognizing the benefits of the future state, acknowledging the drawbacks of maintaining the status quo, highlighting the gaps between present and desired performance, allocating essential resources for implementing the change, and rewarding behaviors that are consistent with the desired change (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

The driving forces behind organizational change can be external, internal, or both (Hallin et al., 2021). PESTEL is a well-known model to analyze external factors in the environment in which a firm operates. It helps organizations understand if external factors impact the organization in a way that necessitates action meaning a change must be initiated (Hallin et al., 2021). PESTEL stands for political, economic, sociocultural, technological, environmental, and legal change factors. Political, sociocultural, and legal change factors may be relevant to this study. Sociocultural change factors include cultural and social norms, values, and morally appropriate trends and pressure organizations to follow specific paths (Hallin et al., 2021; Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015). Legal change factors include rules, legislation, and various regulatory bodies' directives (Hallin et al., 2021). Internal forces behind organizational change refer to factors that originate within an organization (Hallin et al., 2021). Such drivers for change include increased sick leave rates or employee surveys indicating that change is needed. In recent years, many organizations have initiated cultural change projects due to these reasons. However, making a definite differentiation between external and internal drivers of change can prove challenging. These factors often overlap in influencing the direction of change, although certain conditions tend to have a more significant influence than others (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015).
3.3.2 Planning for change

3.3.2.1 Formulating impact goals
To succeed with change, a starting point is planning for change which can be done in several steps (Hallin et al., 2021). The authors state that the initial step is formulating the impact goals, which should be meaningful and quantifiable, allowing for proper measurement and ongoing monitoring of the progress made throughout the change and indicating when the intended change has been carried out successfully. According to Kotter & Cohen (2012), change goals must be conveyed in a manner that resonates with the organization's employees, highlighting the importance of the change, the reasons behind it, the significance of achieving the desired outcomes, and the urgency of the situation.

3.3.2.2 Analyzing conditions for change
In this step, understanding the nature of change is essential to adapt a suitable model, gain an overview of necessary changes and ensure sufficient resources (Hallin et al., 2021). According to Hallin et al. (2021), it can be accomplished by developing a deeper understanding of the change, the individuals it affects, and its desired pace. By (2005) concurs on the importance of understanding the characteristics of change where the desired pace of change is a characteristic of significance. Organizational change can imply a change in roles, values, ways of thinking, behaviors, or a combination of multiple things (Errida & Lotfi, 2021; Hallin et al., 2021). Furthermore, identifying the individuals within and outside the organization impacted by the change, such as coworkers, managers, suppliers, and customers, should be considered. Additionally, it is crucial to identify individuals who hold particular importance for the success of the change (Hallin et al., 2021).

The desired change pace can be incremental, radical/discontinuous, or constant/continuous. Incremental change refers to a small gradual, and stable change and involves addressing individual parts of an organization's issues and objectives one at a time (Feng et al., 2016; By, 2005). Radical/discontinuous change is extensive changes in multiple aspects of an organization during a short timeframe (Hallin et al., 2021). It is characterized by significant shifts in structure, strategy, culture, or in all three (By, 2005). Nevertheless, other authors agree that the advantages of discontinuous changes are short-lived. Besides that, this approach fosters defensive behavior, inward focus, and complacency, leading to situations where significant reforms are frequently necessary. Hallin et al. (2021) state that radical change often fails to stick in organizations due to resilience from coworkers who cannot adapt their behavior to endorse and sustain the change. Incremental change is considered less challenging because it allows employees to adapt to change in a more moderate phase. Constant/continuous change means working with change continuously and enhancing the organization's capacity to improve. Continuous change is the capacity to change fundamentally and continuously to respond to changing circumstances and enhance organizations' capacity to change (By, 2005; Hallin et al., 2021).
3.3.2.3 Creating a communication plan

The final step in planning for change entails creating a communication plan (Hallin et al., 2021). Communication between different individuals affected by the change reduces uncertainty, encourages trust between employees and leaders, and enhances readiness for change. A communication plan includes the message of the change, the communication channels that will be utilized, the frequency of communication, and the individuals accountable for communicating. When mediating the key message of the change, it is important to consider how the recipients will think and feel about the change (Hallin et al., 2021). When working with change in organizational culture, it is exceptionally critical to handle emotions adeptly (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2015). Crafting messages that resonate with not just reason and intellect but also with emotions and imagination holds significance. Kotter and Cohen (2012) state that successful changes do not follow the "analyze-think-change" pattern but instead adhere to the "see-feel-change" sequence. This indicates that a rational message requires visual representation or examples that evoke an emotional response, stimulating individuals' desire to take action. Using storytelling is considered a powerful and influential mechanism while communicating the message of the change (Hallin et al., 2021). Storytelling is especially beneficial in reinforcing organizational culture, and cautionary and encouraging examples can be employed. Additionally, the manager that employees trust and listen to should step forward and communicate the change to ensure it is effectively received. (Hallin et al., 2021)

Lewis et al. (2006) reviewed 100 top-selling books on organizational change to identify common recommendations to succeed with change initiatives. The majority of the books emphasized the importance of communication. First, there was a consensus to inform every level of the organization about the change. Moreover, multiple communication channels were recommended, yet there were differences in opinions of views on the channels that yielded the best outcomes meaning that they were the most effective. However, a variety of communication channels were suggested by most of the authors as a recommended approach. Some alternatives include live speeches, meetings, e-mail or other digital tools, and informal discussions between the change leader and recipients (Armenakis et al., 2011). Different forms of communication can be used to create change readiness: rationales, words, pictures, numbers, colors, and music (Rafferty et al., 2013). Lewis et al. (2006) argues that it is important to maintain a constant flow of information throughout the change, and most authors in the books they reviewed advised that it is necessary to communicate both positive and negative news. While communicating the change, it is crucial to consider not only the content of the message but also the messenger (Hallin et al., 2021). While change managers and specialists have much knowledge, they may need help to connect and reach coworkers in the organization. Instead, the manager that coworkers trust should step forward and communicate the change to ensure it is effectively received.
3.3.3 Implementing change

3.2.3.1 Raising awareness
An important activity to raise awareness is education and training to provide employees with necessary information (Hallin et al., 2021). According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), while initiating organizational culture change, the possible idea is to create an ‘internal university’, meaning having a systematic training strategy at various organizational levels. Training programs can be created by assessing the training needs of the individuals/departments and requesting them to attend these programs. Several other studies highlight the importance of training as an activity to raise awareness of change initiatives. Errida and Lotfi (2021) agree and argue that training increases the individuals’ readiness and involvement in change and thus enhances the implementation of the change. Whether the change is incremental or radical, training fosters change development (Feng et al., 2016).

3.3.3.2 Strengthening engagement
Strengthening engagement activities include supporting the change leaders by practicing communication and handling resistance to change (Hallin et al., 2021). Practicing communication includes four dimensions; communicating at the right time, formulating clear messages, active listening, and offering feedback. The start of a transformational journey may not offer clarity on every detail. However, change leaders must involve employees early in the process, communicate decisively with them about what has been done and is yet to be decided, and engage them in an open dialogue. Elvnäs (2017) claims two questions must be answered to ensure clear communication. The first question is how to convey the message in a way that makes it possible for the people who did not decide about the change to do the same thing as those who decided on it. The second question is how to build consensus around the proposed change. To answer these questions, the sponsor must clarify the desired outcome, why it is important, and which activities and behaviors are needed to achieve it. By identifying which activities and behaviors are needed to achieve the desired outcome, the message will gain instructional value, meaning that people will clearly understand the extent of change. Active listening requires body language, not interrupting, asking follow-up questions, and summarizing the speaker's words. Offering feedback entails offering negative feedback individually and positive feedback publicly. It is also important to offer feedback immediately, regardless of whether it is positive or negative.

3.3.4 Reinforcing change
Reinforcing change can be achieved by consolidating behaviors and evaluating changes (Hallin et al., 2021). As mentioned before, the objectives of the change should be formulated in a way that allows for measurement. Consolidating new behaviors can be done by acknowledging and rewarding desired behavior. According to Hallin et al. (2021), rewarding desired behavior should not only happen upon the completion of a change but also during the ongoing process. Even though there is disagreement among authors regarding whether all individuals are motivated by external rewards, it is evident that certain individuals respond positively to external rewards. Some do not experience much impact on their performance (Härtel & Fujimoto, 2015). Gagné & Deci (2005) state that using external rewards to
motivate employees may harm their internal motivation, negatively affecting their willingness to engage in positive behaviors and psychological well-being. Moreover, celebrating success and attaining certain milestones boosts individuals' motivation to persist (Hallin et al., 2021). The employees are likely to stay committed and motivated when they keep acknowledging the progress in each milestone toward the change. Finally, An evaluation is essential to know how the change is progressing. Once the evaluation is completed, it is necessary to analyze the results to determine whether the change process is progressing as intended or if adjustments to the plan are necessary.
4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

This chapter provides information about the engagements of the case company by introducing different initiatives and resources regarding psychosocial safety. Thereafter, the responses of L1, L2, L3, C1, C2, C3, S1, and S2 (see table 2) are presented regarding psychosocial safety, psychosocial hazards, and psychosocial safety climate. Subsequently, this chapter reviews the psychosocial status of the investigated departments. Furthermore, the findings about change management and its phases are presented.

4.1 The case company’s engagements

The case company has approximately 2000 employees, and in 2022, they had only 5 physical accidents and 22 psychosocial risks reported. Therefore, the case company aims to develop its psychosocial safety internally (L1, 2023).

Change is one of the case company’s values embedded in its culture (company document, 2023). Change is actively praised, encouraged, and promoted in different ways; for example, there is a practice referred to as "the improvement of the month," in which the company designates a safety-related improvement and another general improvement each month (company document, L2, 2023). At the end of the year, the best improvement is selected, and the team responsible for that achievement is rewarded with a travel opportunity (L2, 2023). According to an internal company document, change is defined as a process of moving from a state to a state that is considered better. Even small changes, such as streamlining working methods, optimizing processes, or resolving issues to prevent problems from arising, are recognized as changes (company document, 2023).

Trust is one of the company's values to ensure that everyone trusts each other, trusts that others in the company are doing their best, has respect for each other, as well as has transparency dialogues which are even the company's codes of conduct. The company also has policies & procedures that support psychosocial safety, which supports the employees' health, safety, and well-being (company document, 2023). According to the quarterly meeting and the document of policy for health and work environment, having a healthy and safe work environment adds value to the company by improving productivity, and quality, enhancing employees' well-being, as well as increasing engagement. Furthermore, the safety round meeting participants pointed out that the company's employees face huge psychosocial risks due to the current circumstances and the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic that affected all companies worldwide (safety round meeting, 2023). Therefore, the company is adopting these new policies that encourage every manager to work proactively and actively in promoting a healthy work environment. The responsibility of the managers is to ensure that the labor laws, work procedures, and the company's- directive and code of conduct are implemented. The managers are also responsible for communicating, providing training, and following up on the results and improvements related to occupational health and safety. On the other hand, the employees are
responsible for understanding and following this policy and acting in a way that ensures their own and others' safety and health (company document, safety round meeting & quarterly meeting, 2023).

According to a case company document, the company’s strategy for the promotion of a safe work environment is to prevent accidents, incidents, and occupational hazards, and the company expects all employees to act with openness and trust. Moreover, the company provides employees with information, training, and continuous improvement opportunities to avoid hazards. The company implements best practices for a safe and healthy work environment. According to an internal company document, creating and maintaining a healthy and safe work environment requires continuous improvements. Therefore, to ensure effective implementation, the company expects every employee to actively contribute to developing and maintaining a safe and healthy work environment, which requires integrating safety and health into all of the company’s aspects, including products, facilities, processes, and services. The company expects the managers to measure and improve occupational health and safety with the help of all employees, who are encouraged to identify and report possible hazards and risks. The managers should as well provide access to competent safety and health experts (company document, 2023).

4.1.1 Resources available
Several resources are available in the case company to engage employees in developing psychosocial safety. An overview of them is given below.

4.1.1.1 Incidents and accidents system
There is a dedicated system for reporting incidents and accidents that provides a designated area for reporting psychosocial risks (L1, S1, and C1, 2023). According to L1 (2023), the management team believes it is necessary to report psychosocial hazards in the incidents and accidents system, regardless if the hazard is severe or minor. These reports are kept confidential because they are sensitive; therefore, only HR can see them. L1 (2023) and C1 (2023) mentioned that it is sometimes hard to identify the exact number of the reported psychosocial hazards in the system because some psychosocial hazards are reported as physical accidents.

4.1.1.2 FALK
Another resource provided by the case company is the health center FALK where employees can get help from psychologists when they are experiencing psychosocial hazards, and health coaches that may help with different health tips (L1, L2, C2, and S1, 2023). Furthermore, there is a collaboration between the HR team, the safety & work environment team, and the safety representatives regarding psychosocial issues (S1, 2023). Many respondents pointed out the availability of these elements as favorable conditions that contribute to having an alright level of the psychosocial work environment.
4.1.1.3 Glint
It is an online survey that applies to all employees in the case company and is mandatory to do once a year (L1 & S1, 2023). S2 (2023) stated that this survey is anonymous, so no one knows who has answered the survey, but it is possible to know which group the person belongs to. The departments may compare the results of this survey between the prior year and the current status, which allow the identification of positive (blue), negative (red), and natural (white) aspects of the department. In this way, each department identifies which aspects should be improved.

4.1.1.4 Guinea
L1 and a few other leaders use a pilot system; this system is called the Guinea system. This system is attributed to Guinea's flag (red, yellow, and green). If someone is not feeling well, they may report it as red; if they feel acceptable or okay, they would report it as yellow. If someone feels well and satisfied, they would report it as green (L1, 2023). Moreover, L1 uses Guinea to check the psychosocial safety and well-being of the team daily. Every morning meeting, the team reports to L1 and checks the well-being and whereabouts. L1 mentioned,"If someone is red, I ask if they want to talk with the rest of the team or if they want to talk with me privately. Sometimes it may happen that they are not feeling very well due to personal issues, then I say that I am available if they want any help. But when it relates to psychosocial risks that are caused by the work, then we discuss all in the team about how we in the team will together resolve the issues and if I can support in any possible way"(L1, 2023).

4.1.1.5 Safety rounds
Another way to involve the employees is by doing safety rounds. They are mandatory, conducted twice a year, and involve a question bank that, among other things, includes questions about the psychosocial work environment. While conducting safety rounds, leaders should discuss this question bank with their department employees. Previously, the safety rounds were paper templates, but now they are digital (see Appendix 3). When participating in department 1's safety round meeting, the authors of this report noticed that most of the questions on the checklist focused on physical safety, such as fire protection, chemicals, ergonomics, and physical accidents. However, there were a few items related to psychosocial issues. S1 (2023) mentioned what is missing in the safety rounds question bank that only considers psychosocial safety in the departments. S1 (2023) pointed out that the leaders should go through these questions with their team to address the psychosocial concerns. According to L1 (2023), there are surveys and safety rounds, which are reactive approaches, so no proactive standard indicates how leaders should regularly and proactively develop psychosocial safety.

4.1.1.6 OSA course
Another pilot that L1 (2023) has used is the OSA course. The company collaborates with the Swedish Work Environment Authority to build the OSA course that will become Sweden's standard. The course is still in the preparation phase, has been tested in department 1 (read more about it in section 4.4.2), and is planned to be implemented this year in the autumn (S2,
2023). S2 is involved in this project and mentioned that the OSA course would be provided both for leaders and employees. The OSA course will consist of a theoretical part covering information about OSA, regulations and laws, and what one should do within OSA. There will also be a practical part or training that will include group workshops. Then the participants will do a survey to assess the psychosocial state of the group. From the survey results, the group will be able to create an action plan that identifies psychosocial issues that require attention and improvement. This approach guarantees the involvement of all department members as everyone tries to solve their psychosocial issues (S2, 2023).

4.2 Psychosocial safety & psychosocial hazards

4.2.1 The impacts of work environment

All respondents agreed that the work environment affects the employees’ mental health, well-being, and productivity. S2 (2023) claimed that a negative work environment (both physical and psychosocial) might contribute to feeling bad at work, which may cause worse work results. The respondent agreed that a positive psychosocial environment contributes to improving productivity. Both C2 (2023) and L2 (2023) mentioned that a work environment can positively impact the employees’ mental health. They argued that a positive work environment where employees feel free and comfortable may contribute to engaging them to think about new ideas and be creative (L2, 2023). Also, when someone is having a hard time privately, but having good results at work, having supportive colleagues as well as supportive leaders, may have a huge positive impact on the employees’ mental health (C2, 2023).

4.2.2 Psychosocial safety

Some respondents claimed that they and their colleagues are aware of psychosocial safety and the company’s policies. Still, they asserted that they do not have the knowledge of the proper definition. C3 (2023) claimed that they do not have knowledge about the company’s policies and procedures regarding psychosocial safety, they do know that there are policies regarding it, but they have never talked about it in their department meetings. S2 (2023) claimed that psychosocial safety is not acknowledged and talked about in the manufacturing industry, the respondent mentioned “There are laws that say how it should be handled, and it is not something we can avoid; there are laws on how to handle OSA, namely the organizational psychosocial work environment in the company. It is not widespread for people to have a clear understanding of OSA, its implications, and the associated rights and responsibilities of employees. While some may be familiar with their rights, some obligations come with them. Furthermore, some managers may not possess adequate knowledge on the subject beyond the notion that it is important to treat their staff with kindness. Few are aware of the scientific basis of OSA, and even fewer are aware of the potential impact on work performance should OSA or psychosocial aspects be neglected.” (S2, 2023).

However, although there were slight variations in how individuals defined psychosocial safety, their overall understanding of the concept was almost the same. Some mentioned that psychosocial safety is about feeling psychologically safe at work, free to find new ideas as
well as free to be creative. Others mentioned that psychosocial safety relates to having clear tasks and the needed knowledge and skills, not only clearly defined working tasks but also meaningful tasks as well as a balanced workload. Both S1 (2023), L1 (2023), and C2 (2023) mentioned that psychosocial safety is also about the relationships between colleagues in the workplace, as well as the relationship between the employees and the leaders.

4.2.3 Psychosocial hazards

Regarding psychosocial hazards, six of eight respondents have experienced psychosocial hazards at the workplace. Three respondents claimed that stress emerged in their workdays, but they could handle it, and have not affected their mental health significantly. Two respondents mentioned that they had not experienced psychosocial hazards at work. Many respondents had a different understanding of psychosocial hazards. Usually, they describe the psychosocial hazards from their own experiences. S2 (2023) and S1 (2023) claim that people can be distressed in different ways, such as feeling stress when it is work overload as well as feeling unwell when having a calmer workload. Many respondents argued that it is difficult with the psychosocial work environment because private life may significantly impact the employees’ mental health. Namely, what the employees may experience as a negative in work may be based on their personal life situation and vice versa. Therefore, many respondents stated that it is difficult to understand the root causes of psychosocial hazards since it is usually hard to talk about one’s personal issues. For instance, most of the respondents mentioned that they had experienced psychosocial risks such as stress. C3 (2023) experienced distress and was close to burnout. Therefore, they reported these risks in the incidents and accidents system and had to contact a psychologist (C4, 2023). C3 (2023) referred to unclear expectations, job descriptions, unclear work instructions, high work overload, and lack of leaders' availability when they meet troubles. Furthermore, another respondent C2 (2023), mentioned different reasons for their experience, for instance, having unclear expectations, unreasonable goals, time pressure to deliver a result, taking too much responsibility when trying to deliver on time, and insufficient information, and unclear priorities from the management.

Regarding managing the psychosocial hazards, many respondents mentioned that it depends on the situation. In some situations, they may only ask for help from their colleagues. In other situations, they need to have a dialogue with their leader, while with complex psychosocial concerns, they need to take support from professionals such as the company’s health center. Many respondents also mentioned that even if they experience that some of their colleagues do not feel well, they go through the following process. Firstly, they ask the person if they need any help, then they give tips to have a dialogue with their leader. If the person experiences a dire situation, they recommend getting professional help. The respondents also mentioned that they have only used the incidents and accidents system to report challenging situations. C1 (2023) mentioned that even in their department, where they are responsible for the incidents and accidents system, they might not report all psychosocial hazards because they try to solve the problem within the team before it develops into a severe risk. Some stress may arise within the department, but it is under control since the team is good at
collaborating to solve the problem (C1, 2023). However, L1 (2023) mentioned that all psychosocial hazards should be reported to maintain psychosocial safety proactively.

Another aspect that the respondents mentioned is remote work. All respondents agreed that a certain level of remote work is positive for the employees' mental health. Nevertheless, too much remote work may affect communication negatively and make it harder for the leader to identify the psychosocial risks. C3 (2023) mentioned that hybrid work is a positive aspect of maintaining the psychosocial risk because it may help to decrease the concerns that affect mental health.

### 4.3 Psychosocial safety climate

Except for C3 (2023), all respondents rated the current level of psychosocial safety in the workplace as quite positive due to the reasons that will be discussed. L1 (2023), S1 (2023), and S2 (2023), described that a positive aspect is that the company is more concerned with psychosocial safety now than before. Furthermore, the company has different plans and regulations that will contribute to developing psychosocial safety and the company's different conditions, such as safety representatives and the company's health center Falk (S1, S2 and L1, 2023). Another positive aspect mentioned by S1 is the collaboration between actors within the company, such as HR, safety representatives, and the work environment team, regarding stress and other psychosocial risks. L3 acknowledged that despite the challenging situation the company faced during the past three years because of due to COVID-19, the company has and is trying to develop positive psychosocial safety. S1 (2023) claimed that there had been progress in the company’s psychosocial safety, but the critical area for improvement is handling tasks directly and willing to speak openly about these issues. C3 (2023) thought that the psychosocial level was only all right due to work overload and unclear expectations.

#### 4.3.1 PSC factors

Various factors should be improved in order to promote favorable psychosocial safety at the workplace that has been mentioned by the respondents. Many respondents highlighted communication, ambiguity, clarity in roles or tasks, leaders' roles, workload, and work planning. All respondents agreed that effective communication is a critical factor for a psychosocially safe environment. C2 (2023) experienced stress due to ineffective communication while working with different departments on a project, and each department has its demand. Another critical factor they faced was unclear job demands and sometimes facing unreasonable goals while having time pressure. Simultaneously, C3 (2023) has experienced burnout symptoms due to high work overload while missing a supportive leader that prioritized the work demands. The other critical factor needed more effective communication, making it hard for the employees to obtain the needed information.

S1 (2023) highlighted that effective communication and information flow are significant for a psychosocially safe work environment. The leadership team has noticed that when they are not proactive in providing information, it affects the entire factory. S1 (2023) claims that the
information flow is excellent in some departments, and in others, it comes to a halt. It depends on the individuals involved, with some being unsure about what to say or not and others being very transparent. L2 (2023) mentioned that even having too much passion is a critical factor that may impact the employees' mental health. Therefore, the leader's responsibility here is to chart the work for the employees and support them in finding their way.

To develop psychosocial safety, the respondents mentioned promoting transparency and trust, which are the company's values. Then, the employees should trust their leaders, be comfortable finding new ideas, and talk openly (L2, S2, L1, S1, 2023). Another factor mentioned by the respondents to develop psychosocial safety is representing the meaning and contribution of the employees' work to feel that they contribute something meaningful (C1, C2, L1, L2, and S1, 2023). Many respondents have also agreed that communication, obviousness, and dialogue are critical factors in developing psychosocial safety. Furthermore, when presenting the factors mentioned in the literature in the (section 3.1.3) to identify which factor the respondents think is the most important, 7 of 8 respondents thought that leadership and management is the most critical factor. In contrast, one respondent thought it depends on the situation. Most of the respondents thought that developing the psychosocial safety of all employees and leaders has a more significant responsibility since they must engage all employees. Therefore, it requires collaboration between leaders and employees. "We are each other's work environment" mentioned by the respondents and in different meetings; the employees may contribute to developing psychosocial safety by following the guidelines and code of conduct that show how to behave towards each other. Moreover, the employees may contribute by helping each other, giving feedback, and being transparent (quarterly meeting, 2023).

Many respondents argued that to develop psychosocial safety, there are various behaviors, such as open discussions and dialogue and involving everyone in the team. It is also important to show understanding, clarify work tasks, and promote participation. Take time to listen to the employees and their concerns, give them priorities when needed, support them, and analyze what needs to be done to promote a better psychosocial work environment. S1 (2023) and S2 (2023) claim that promoting open communication, trust, and transparency is essential, which discusses psychosocial issues. S1 (2023) points out that even if the leaders have too much to do in their workday, they meet their employees somehow. Therefore, even if the manager takes 2 minutes of their workday to check the status of the employees and how they are feeling, thus leaders should promote an open climate to make the employees willing to talk about their psychosocial experiences. On the other hand, L1 (2023) believes it is only possible to be a good leader by being an effective communicator; therefore, leadership and management are the most crucial factors. Regardless of how good the department situation is, efficient and competent management is necessary for problems to arise sooner eventually (L1, 2023). However, L1 (2023) pointed out that communication is a critical aspect of competent leadership, but leadership and management is the most crucial factor for developing psychosocial safety.
4.3.2 Leadership

However, according to seven of eight respondents, the wrong type of leadership may impact psychosocial safety a lot. Still, there is no specific leadership style that is the most suitable for developing psychosocial safety. The respondents mentioned that each situation requires different leadership styles, some situations require delegating leadership styles, and other situations require authoritarian leadership. According to them, it depends on the situation and also on the maturity level of the group. S1 (2023), L1 (2023), and S2 (2023) emphasized that involving leadership behaviors which in turn fosters employees engagement and commitment. This, in turn helps the case company to achieve the goal of 100% involvement that entails actively involving all employees in decision-making (quarterly meetings, 2023). But, sometimes, 100% involvement may be misunderstood because it does not mean that the leaders should avoid contributing (S1, 2023). Consequently, the leaders should be engaged, involved, and supportive while also involving the employees and giving them a chance to be engaged (S1, 2023). According to L1, the leaders should be stable, understand their own goals, and roadmap the department.

L1 (2023) asserted that employees have a responsibility to contribute to promoting psychosocial safety. The employees’ participation is a good starting point for identifying the desired psychosocial work environment, which is the responsibility of the leaders. L1 (2023) emphasized the essential role of the involvement and discussion of the psychosocial issues with the team members in this process because when calibrating with the team members, leaders may ensure that everyone is on the same page. The psychosocial issues can be discussed during the check-in meetings or safety rounds to ensure that everyone in the team is concerned about these issues. Based on the experience of L1 (2023), when the issues are identified and discussed, they often turn out to be less significant than one initially thought. By allowing the team members to voice their ideas, thoughts, and opinions, the leaders may create a sense of involvement and foster a positive work environment. Leaders may ensure everyone’s involvement by using the method of storytelling about what they aim to achieve and steer each activity towards developing the team members’ knowledge about these issues. By leading through storytelling, the team members can see the whole picture and act independently according to the department’s story, making them secure to make the decisions and more involved in the process of developing psychosocial safety (L1, 2023).

4.4 Reviewing the departments’ psychosocial status

This section will provide a comparison between the three investigated departments, department 1 which has relatively better psychosocial status, and two other departments (2 and 3) that have a challenging status. Comparing the departments is relevant to establish best practices when improving psychosocial safety. It provides an opportunity to identify the actions taken in department 1 and help provide insight into effective ways to develop psychosocial safety in the other two departments. The insights may also be beneficial for the entire organization.
4.4.1 Department 1

Department 1 consists mainly of managers and engineers, and no major psychosocial problems were detected (L1, 2023). C1 (2023) stated that some stress might arise, but it is at least effectively managed by the team that collaborates to resolve the issue. When L1 (2023) became the leader of department 1, the department faced a challenging situation. Two departments were merged into department 1, and one of the merged departments already had been struggling with various psychosocial issues such as work overload, stress, and lack of clarity. One of the employees suggested the OSA survey to address these issues, so L1 (2023) conducted the OSA survey (see appendix), which includes questions on different areas. The survey result revealed relatively low levels of satisfaction in the team, especially in work organization and leadership. This survey prompted them to focus on improving these two areas. Later, the team members concretely discussed what needs improvement in work organization and leadership. In the work organization, role description, distribution of tasks, and communication were examples of concrete areas of improvement. Each area of improvement progresses through the following four stages: dialogue, improvement suggestions, test improvement, and experiences. Once one area is completed, the next one is taken up, and the process starts over, as described in Figure 2 below (L1, 2023).

![Improvement circle (own construction, inspired by the case company document of OSA survey)](image)

C1 (2023) expressed that conducting the survey and the discussions were beneficial, resulting in a better understanding of what should be done to improve psychosocial safety. The department is recently conducting the same survey this year to further improve the psychosocial safety. Finally, safety rounds is another initiative that is an activity conducted in department 1. However, C1 (2023) stated that they do not report all kinds of psychosocial risks in the accidents and incidents system, but L1 (2023) expressed the importance of reporting all kinds of psychosocial risks to be able to proactively promote a positive psychosocial work environment. Additionally, L1 (2023) expressed the need to continue using the OSA survey and attending the OSA course, which emphasizes problem-solving and reactive training.
4.4.2 Department 2

Department 2 comprises managers and project leaders working on projects with a collaboration with different departments (L2, 2023). Stress is the primary issue negatively affecting the department's psychosocial work environment. C2, (2023) mentioned that sometimes the project goals had been considered unrealistic. When working on projects, project managers sometimes face a lack of assistance from the management team in prioritizing project requirements. Therefore, C2, (2023) claimed that there is a need to determine what should be prioritized and what risks may be taken. Both project managers and management team need to engage in discussions and agree on what should be prioritized because project managers usually find it challenging to handle this task independently (C2, 2023).

L2 is aware of the problem of high stress and has tried to solve the psychosocial concern in different ways. They have department meetings every week where we share information and solve tasks together. They have improvement group meetings every two weeks where the group leads improvement work. Moreover, they conduct monthly check-ins to discuss employee satisfaction with their tasks, development opportunities, and the steps needed to achieve their goals (L2, 2023). L2 (2023) provides the team different lectures about stress and stress management. Furthermore, Improvement group days are organized offsite every quarter for the entire team. During half a day, the team engages in various exercises to foster group development, and then they proceed with improvement work. Additionally, they have project meetings, where the structure of project meetings allows project managers to arrange these meetings independently. They even hold escalation meetings every other week, where L2 individually meets with each team member for half an hour to discuss their progress and provide coaching. Finally, within the group, there is a reference group comprising many team members who have volunteered. This enables them to showcase their work and receive feedback from the reference group. Agile working methods is a bigger change that the team is currently investigating (L2, 2023). L2 (2023) thinks it may be beneficial for their situation since agile working methods implies working in short cycles and being able to adjust to changing needs. In addition, this way of working places people as the key foundation.

4.4.3 Department 3

Department 3 comprises individuals that work as the last point of contact with the customers and maintain the closest and most direct interaction with them. Work overload and ambiguity about what is expected of each person and the department, are the primary issues affecting the employees’ well-being (L3 & C3, 2023). Both respondents from department 3 expressed that the department has experienced psychosocially challenging situations requiring them to seek a psychologist's assistance. A psychologist met with the entire group and analyzed the situation. C3 (2023) found it interesting to hear the analysis, but since there was no follow-up, the respondent does not believe it was helpful. C3 (2023) stated "We have only received the summary of the psychologist's conversation, but there was no follow-up. After that, we have not heard a word from our departments, and no one asks how we are when we go to work. So following up is incredibly important in order to feel seen." The respondent
seemed frustrated and upset about the situation and revealed that their previous leader was absent. The previous leader of department 3 showed no concern for the psychosocial problems, failed to address the issues and could not prioritize tasks correctly (C3, 2023). It is essential to highlight that L3 (2023) entered the department only approximately five months ago, i.e., after the department’s meeting with the psychologist.

L3 (2023) claimed that in his 26 years at the case company, the respondent has never encountered a department that needs a manager's presence like this one. When the L3 was asked what the respondent is doing to improve the situation, the following was claimed: “We are working on looking at what our responsibilities are in the department so that we do not take on more work. We want to be involved and influence it instead of taking on too much work and thus creating stress, frustration, and irritation. Now we are checking the tasks one by one and the job descriptions. We are in the process of hiring new staff for the department in order to be able to spread the responsibility, so that role descriptions need to be rewritten. I also initially have weekly meetings with around 75% of the department and check what they need help with”, (L3, 2023).

C3 (2023) pointed out that there has been no significant psychosocial change except for a decrease in workload. Nevertheless, the fundamental issue has not been addressed, leaving the department vulnerable if similar challenges were to arise in the future. C3 (2023) perceives that insufficient time is being allocated to addressing the concerns regarding work overload and clarifying the department's responsibilities. C3 (2023) claimed that the department is not working in the right direction to solve the issues, instead of having collaborative meetings and discussing their concerns as a team, individual interviews had been conducted. There have been no scheduled meetings to focus on this matter truly, and instead, there have only been brief discussions here and there during department meetings (C3, 2023).

4.4.4. Psychosocial status generally

According to S1 (2023), the change needed is initiating the safety rounds to improve psychosocial safety in the organization. The respondent thinks that the rounds will help to dare to ask difficult questions and also have the courage to handle the answers and address the outcome. However, S1 (2023) thought that it requires a question bank in the safety rounds that only considers psychosocial safety, to be able to address the psychosocial issues. According to S2 (2023), the change needed is to talk about it because if they do not, the problems will increase. Only talking is not a comprehensive solution, but doing so indicates a mindset that prioritizes psychosocial considerations. While various tools and resources exist, they do not hold the greatest importance. C1 (2023) pointed out the importance of routines, resources, and having a strategy for working with it.
4.5 Change management to develop psychosocial safety

4.5.1 Introduction to change management
All respondents agreed on the significance of change and effective change management. When asked about the rationale behind the importance of change and change management, the respondents expressed similar viewpoints, emphasizing that it is essential for the company's survival, competitiveness, and overall attractiveness in the market. L1 (2023) added, "When I talk about change management with my team, I tell them that there is only one constant thing in our existence, and that is change."
The respondents agreed that the driving force behind changing and improving psychosocial safety in the organization is both internal and external. S2 (2023) indicated that external factors, such as stakeholders who demand the organization from customers, employees, and society, make it necessary to improve psychosocial safety. The respondent also suggested that there is an internal driver since changing and improving can generate profit for the company. C1 (2023) agreed with S2 regarding the internal driver and emphasized that improving psychosocial safety is crucial for the case company's economic success. Furthermore, L1 (2023) indicated that while the case company needs to follow legislation concerning the working environment, its policy goes above and beyond these requirements.

4.5.2 Key factors for managing a cultural change
Furthermore, the respondents were asked what characterizes change management of organizational culture, and their answers revealed several key factors:

- **Leadership:** L2 (2023) suggested, "If we are to talk about culture change, we need leaders to show the way and be good role models." L3 (2023) emphasized, "Leadership is significant; the leaders are the ones who set the culture and show what is acceptable and what is not." Finally, C2 (2023) pointed out the importance of "Leading by example," meaning demonstrating the desired behaviors and attitudes in order to encourage their adoption by others.
- **Involving co-workers:** Three respondents discussed the significance of involving co-workers. L2 (2023) suggested, "Leaders need to motivate and involve co-workers to change." C1 (2023) emphasized the need to develop a strategy to ensure everyone is on board, stating, "A strategy needs to be developed to ensure everyone is on board" (C1, 2023). C2 (2023) highlighted that "Involvement is achieved when everyone is aware of the direction we are heading towards and what is expected of them" (C2, 2023). Finally, S2 (2023) stressed that "employees must be involved."
- **Reinforcing the cultural change:** L3 (2023), C1 (2023), and C2 (2023) emphasized the need for change to be requested and followed up in order for it to be sustained.
- **It takes time:** C1 (2023) and S1 (2023) agreed that changing or improving a culture takes time. S1 (2023) mentioned that changing a culture is a process, and people must be trained in a new culture.
4.5.3 Planning, implementing and reinforcing change

The respondents were asked to provide their input on what each phase of the change process should encompass. (Some respondents classified awareness and engagement as activities in the planning phase, although they are presented in the implementing phase for easier comparison with the theory in the analysis)

4.5.3.1 Planning for change

C1 pointed out the importance of being clear about the goal of the change. The respondent also highlighted the importance of having a long-term strategy and he/she stated that it is crucial to ascertain what actions will be taken when the change is implemented already during the planning phase. Measuring psychosocial safety is not easy (L1, S1, S2, 2023). However, it be linked to long-term, and short-term sick leaves and burnout which is the ultimate sign (S2, 2023). If the long-term sick leave and burnout increase, it is connected to a worse psychosocial work environment. Another way to measure psychosocial safety is anonymous surveys such as the Glint. Further, many other respondents highlighted the significance of understanding why the change is needed. L1 (2023) suggested that when explaining the reasons for change, it is essential to communicate the personal benefits with a "what is in it for me" approach, utilizing storytelling techniques to persuade the listener. Also, L1 (2023) stated that when presenting a change, the respondent never talks about change but an improvement. The respondent chooses to explain it this way, as it is uncommon to completely discard existing systems and start from scratch. L2 (2023) supported this viewpoint by emphasizing the importance of having a pragmatic plan for the change, conveying the idea of beginning with a small-scale initiative and observing its progress before making further decisions or adjustments. S1 (2023) and S2 (2023) agreed and stated that change is a gradual process that demands patience and perseverance, highlighting that refraining from rushing through change is critical for achieving a successful change.

Regarding the communication of change, S1 (2023) suggested a variety of communication channels as the respondent mentioned visual representations, including boards and digital displays, as the respondent highlighted that making the change visible is helpful to achieve it. Furthermore, the respondent emphasized the importance of maintaining regular communication, even during the phase of reinforcing change.

4.5.3.2 Implementing change

Raising awareness and strengthening engagement were common responses. C1 (2023) and C2 (2023) mentioned strengthening engagement can be achieved by involving everyone affected by the change. S1 (2023) noted that the optimal scenario is to make the leaders feel that “This idea of change is so good! It's the best we've ever had” because their attitude toward change will significantly impact the employees. Moreover, S2 (2023) added the importance of desire and knowledge in this phase and meant. The respondent stated that desire is extremely challenging yet highly significant for ensuring the long-term effectiveness of change. The respondent pointed out that desire is challenging because not everyone finds change enjoyable, but it is crucial for everyone to at least accept it. With knowledge, the respondent emphasized the importance of acquiring the necessary tools and training, such as
workshops, to execute the change effectively. In this phase, the key is to work persistently (L3, 2023), deal with the adversities that arise (C1, 2023), and adjust if something goes wrong (L2, 2023). Furthermore, being clear with the goal of change, communication & open dialogue (C1, 2023), and offering feedback are further activities mentioned by the respondents (C3, 2023).

4.5.3.3 Reinforcing change
This phase was highlighted as a challenge by C2 (2023). C1 (2023) mentioned that developing psychosocial safety is a continuous process that needs to be followed up continuously. S1 (2023) suggested maintaining ongoing dialogue in the channels mentioned above and that remembering why the change was made in the first place is crucial even in this phase. Many other respondents highlighted the importance of repeatedly bringing up the change topic and reminding everybody involved in the change why it was made in the first place. According to C3 (2023), follow-up is one of the most important things in reinforcing change. The respondent discussed a personal experience of undergoing a change where they felt lacking this aspect. The respondent believes initiating a change without a long-term plan and a follow-up strategy is meaningless. L3 (2023) pointed out that the change needs to be requested; otherwise, it will not be sustained.
A large majority of the respondents agreed that achieving change should be celebrated, appreciated, and recognized. There were different opinions about money as a reward. It was discussed that money could be a driving force, but mostly that only money may not be enough and even inhibiting. S2 (2023) mentioned that money as a reward could even drive a psychosocial problem and create stress, and L3 (2023) noted that "one reward system does not have to exclude the other." However, that money as a reward might result in employees thinking, "I am not making any money from this. Then I will not do it" (L3, 2023). L1 (2023) mentioned that research shows that financial rewards are short-lived and can ultimately lead to dissatisfaction. The respondent added, "I believe that the best reward system is for individuals to realize that they are part of a larger context, a bigger picture; it is through narratives and storytelling that one understands the context" (L1, 2023). In order to help someone grasp the overall understanding, it is necessary to guide employees by asking, "How does the current experience compare to the previous one?" (L1, 2023). This approach seeks to awaken strong emotions that last for a long time. However, S1 (2023) prefers rewards involving collective activities, such as going out and eating with the team.

4.6 Challenges in developing psychosocial safety
The respondents highlighted the most significant challenges to developing specifically psychosocial safety in the workplace. The main challenges are presented below:

4.6.1 Insufficient fostering of psychosocial dialogue
Both L3 (2023) and S2 (2023) noted that it is a challenge to talk about psychosocial problems. L3 (2023) further emphasized the need to create a culture where it is okay to talk about psychosocial problems. Additionally, S2 (2023) highlighted that "getting an openness, daring to talk about the problems is a huge challenge" (S2, 2023). The respondent meant that
expressing "I don't feel well" (S2, 2023) requires a great deal of courage from individuals, but not everyone has been encouraged to do so. S1 (2023) agreed that discussing psychosocial problems is challenging within the case company and stressed the significance of not only asking how someone is doing but also being prepared to receive a negative response, handling it appropriately, and assisting the person in making informed choices based on the situation.

4.6.2 Large quantity of employees per group

Both L3 (2023) and S1 (2023) highlighted too large groups as a challenge. They emphasized the need to create smaller groups to enhance problem identification and communication while also promoting a culture that encourages open discussions. L3 (2023) intended that some groups today include 50-60 people, making it very difficult to capture psychosocial problems.

4.6.3 The absence of the leader

C3 (2023) emphasized the importance for leaders to allocate sufficient time and incorporate it into their responsibilities to regularly monitor and evaluate the well-being of themselves and their employees. The respondent emphasized his/her personal experience of stress resulting from an excessive workload, highlighting the crucial need for a leader who prioritizes tasks during overwhelming periods. In the respondent's department, a morning meeting is typically held, where risk observations and assessments are addressed, but they are only linked to physical risks, not psychological ones. However, there is a lack of concern regarding the employees' well-being (C3, 2023). S1 (2023) suggested regular staff assessments for periodic evaluations or assessments, especially in departments that have experienced or experienced psychosocial risks.
5. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This part aims to provide insights into developing the psychosocial safety climate in global manufacturing companies by analyzing and discussing the research questions. Specifically, this section seeks to analyze and discuss the following research questions:

1. How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate?
2. How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate?

5.1 Psychosocial safety and psychosocial hazards

5.1.1 The impact of the work environment on employees

According to the case company, they aim to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate proactively (L1, 2023). This is due to, among other things, the new Swedish regulations highlighting the importance of proactively promoting a positive psychosocial work environment (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2022). Furthermore, the EU Commission (2021) mentions that half of the European employees experience stress at work, which is the reason for 50% of all missed work days. Leka et al. (2010) claim that mental health problems and stress are the biggest reasons for premature death and health concerns. The case company mentioned they are on their way to zero physical accidents. However, 22 psychosocial risks were reported in 2022, and 6 reported psychosocial risks until April 2023 of approximately 2000 employees. ILO (n.d) claims that to achieve good working conditions, it is essential to ensure that employees are safe from both physical and psychological harm. Therefore, the EU Commission (2021) mentions that the OSH laws are critical to ensure the employees’ safety and well-being since these regulations have contributed to decreasing the health hazards in the workplace. It can be concluded that the case company is aware of the work environment's impact on the employees' mental health. The case company follows the European and Swedish laws that consider the psychosocial work environment. They also aim to promote a positive work environment proactively.

Furthermore, the Swedish Work Environment Authority introduced OSA regulations to promote a positive work environment and prevent accidents and mental health in the workplace (Arbetsmiljöverket, 2016). Schulte et al. (2022) claim that a productive and healthy workforce must have a healthy work environment. Macaluso et al. (2021) also mention that the psychosocial work environment affects the employees' health. All respondents agreed that the work environment affects the employees' mental health and productivity, namely, being creative, achieving good results at work, and having supportive leaders and colleagues may positively impact the employees’ mental health. Moreover, they pointed out that feeling unwell will lead to lower productivity. Contrariwise, a positive psychosocial work environment may improve the employees' productivity and help them achieve good results, which may lead to feeling better even if the employees are having a hard time privately (S1, S2, L2, C2, 2023). It can be determined that the respondents confirmed the theoretical claim and are aware of the impact of the work environment on employees' mental health, well-being, and productivity. In conclusion, a positive work
environment will lead to a more productive workforce, contributing to achieving the company’s various targets.

5.1.2 Psychosocial Safety Climate
Dollard and Bakker (2010) mention that a psychosocial safety climate (PSC) is a theory that describes the organization’s procedures, policies, and practices that protect the psychological safety and health of the employees. Some respondents were aware of psychosocial safety and the company’s policies related to psychosocial safety. S2 (2023) argued that the employees do not have a common understanding of the regulations of OSA. Many lack awareness of its implications, rights, and associated responsibilities. Additionally, S2 (2023) pointed out that leaders may lack knowledge of the psychosocial safety aspects. Other respondents mentioned that they only have a limited discussion about psychosocial safety in their department meetings. Based on the respondents’ answers, it was noticed that there is a lack of a shared common understanding among the employees about psychosocial safety; even some leaders have inadequate knowledge.

5.1.3 Psychosocial Hazards
5.1.3.1 Addressing PSH in the case company
Llorens et al. (2019) and Houdmont & Leka (2010) state that PSH is the workplace's psychological and social factors that negatively impact employees' well-being and safety. PSH includes experiencing distress, stress, harassment, bullying, lack of support and recognition, and poor working conditions. According to the respondents, six of eight have experienced psychosocial workplace hazards, including distress, stress, and lack of support. Three of the six respondents experiencing PSH claimed that stress is emerging daily in their work, but they could handle it, and it did not affect their mental health significantly. This means that three of eight respondents have experienced psychosocial workplace hazards that have affected their mental health and well-being noticeably. Some respondents mentioned that they had experienced psychosocial risks such as distress, others had experienced stress, and others had experienced burnout symptoms. Two respondents had usually experienced stress at work; one employee (C3) was very close to burnout and reported this risk in the incidents and accidents system. However, S2 (2023) and S1 (2023) highlighted that people could be stressed for various reasons; some feel stressed when having a low workload, and others feel stressed when they have a high workload. The respondents mentioned that it is complex to identify the root causes of psychosocial hazards since they may relate to personal issues that the employees are unwilling to discuss. For example, employees experiencing a negative workday may be based on their personal life situation and vice versa. Therefore, they assume that it is complex to identify the root causes of psychosocial hazards since people usually do not talk about their issues.

According to the definition of PSH by Llorens et al. (2019) and Houdmont and Leka (2010), experiencing a negative workday based on their personal life situation is not PSH. The case company still addresses psychosocial problems that stem from outside the workplace (L3). It
can be concluded that regardless of what the root cause of the psychosocial hazards are, and regardless of whether they are caused from or outside, the case company still addresses them.

5.1.3.2 Factors that contribute to PSH
Psychosocial risks can arise from work conditions such as heavy workloads, unclear job responsibilities or contradictory demands, limited decision-making authority, lack of control over job duties, ineffective communication and lack of support from coworkers or managers, handling job insecurity and organizational change incompetently, and violence that includes sexual and psychological harassment, interpersonal relationships at work (Hupke, 2022; Leka et al., 2017). The respondents pointed out various factors that they have experienced that contribute to PSH at the workplace, such as lack of communication, unclear roles or tasks, lack of the availability of leaders, time pressure, high workload, inefficient work planning, unclear expectation and responsibilities, unreasonable goals, insufficient information, and unclear priorities from management. Some of the factors mentioned in the theoretical claim can be confirmed in the empirical findings, such as heavy workloads, unclear job responsibilities or contradictory demands, ineffective communication, and lack of support from managers were factors experienced by the respondents. However, other factors not mentioned in the theoretical frame were mentioned by the respondents. Such factors include unclear roles or tasks, time pressure, inefficient work planning, unreasonable goals, and insufficient information.

During the safety round meeting, it was mentioned that the company’s employees are facing huge psychosocial risks due to the COVID-19 outcomes, such as remote work. However, L3 (2023) mentioned that, despite the situation in these difficult three years due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the company is trying to develop a positive psychosocial work environment. Many studies, such as Harsini et al. (2022) and Gruiskens et al. (2023), have addressed the psychosocial risks related to remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Gruiskens et al. (2023) pointed out that remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted employees’ mental health due to social isolation and unclear personal and work boundaries. Many respondents agreed that a certain level of remote work is positive for the employees' mental health. However, constantly having remote work may affect communication negatively and makes it harder for the leader to identify the psychosocial risks. Drawing from this, the COVID-19 pandemic has further increased the impact on the employees’ well-being and mental health because of the remote, which is an outcome of the pandemic. As claimed in the theoretical framework, remote work has negatively affected communication and made it harder to identify employees' well-being. However, remote work also has some positive effects on mental health.

5.1.4 PSC factors
Seven respondents out of eight rated the current level of psychosocial safety as generally positive. Some key aspects mentioned are the increased concern for psychosocial safety, the implementation of plans and regulations, the collaboration between the departments regarding the PSH, the presence of safety representatives, and a company health center. C3
(2023) claimed it had become a lower workload, resulting in a relatively satisfactory psychosocial level. However, it was noticed that some improvements should be made to achieve a positive PSC. The respondents emphasized that developing psychosocial safety requires various aspects, such as open discussions, dialogue, involvement of the entire team, understanding, clarifying work tasks, promoting participation, active listening, prioritizing employee concerns, providing support, and analyzing the necessary steps for a better psychosocial work environment. Dollard et al. (2019) and Houdmont and Leka (2010) agreed that in order to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate, there are critical factors that should be taken into consideration, such as supportive policies, effective communication, leadership and management, work design, as well as training and awareness, which validate many of the aspects mentioned by the respondents.

5.1.4.1 Supportive policies
The case company prioritizes trust, respect, and transparency among its values (company document). It promotes policies and procedures that prioritize psychosocial safety and the well-being of employees. The company recognizes that a healthy and safe work environment increases productivity, quality, employee well-being, and engagement. The company is implementing new policies to encourage managers to actively promote a healthy work environment and ensure compliance with labor laws and company directives (company document). According to the company’s policies, managers are responsible for communication, training, and monitoring improvements related to occupational health and safety. On the other hand, the co-workers are responsible for understanding and following the policy and acting in a way that prioritizes their own and others' safety and health.

Some of the respondents claimed that they are aware that there are policies regarding psychosocial safety. However, they do not have a deeper understanding of them due to insufficient fostering of psychosocial safety dialogue in different meetings. Tagoe & Amponsah-Tawiah (2019) and Leitão & Greiner (2017) state that supportive policies are an essential factor in promoting a positive psychosocial climate since the organizations should have policies that are supportive and aim to proactively preventing employees’ mental health by providing them support and access to mental health services. Based on the theoretical claim, supportive policies should be the guideline for the employees on how to act to promote a positive PSC. The case company already has supportive policies that split the responsibility of promoting a positive psychosocial work environment for all of the employees. However, the policies should be more addressed for the employees since it is also important that each employee has knowledge about the company’s policies regarding the PSC.

5.1.4.2 Effective communication
S1 observed that information flow varies across departments, with some departments experiencing excellent communication while others face significant challenges due to individuals being unsure about being disclosed or highly transparent. Våtstjkjold Hamre (2023) asserts that organizations that promote transparent and open communication can more easily promote trust and respect in the workplace. The author states that effective communication encompasses informal communication, such as regular team meetings, and
formal communication, which are policies and procedures. Many respondents noted that formal and informal communication is present in the case company. All respondents pointed out that it is essential to have effective communication, clearness, and dialogue, as well as promoting transparency and trust to develop psychosocial safety is essential. S1 (2023) highlighted the importance of effective communication and information flow for creating a psychosocially safe work environment. The management team recognized that failing to proactively share information negatively impacts the organization (S1). C2 (2023) experienced stress due to ineffective communication while working with different departments on a project. C3 (2023) also identified ineffective communication as a significant challenge, making it extremely difficult for employees to access the necessary information. The case company is following Idris et al. (2015) statement, which highlights the significance of effective communication, as it enables employees to stay informed about their work situation and the company's happenings while having their opinions, concerns, and ideas heard; this engagement contributes to a sense of belonging and community. Furthermore, when the employees feel a sense of belonging to a team striving for a shared goal, they experience a sense of purpose and motivation to achieve different objectives (Naji et al., 2021).

In consequence, effective communication is a critical factor for the employees' well-being both in communicating about psychosocial issues and having a general effective communication. Having ineffective communication may trigger PSH, such as stress and distress. Effective communication is also important in discussing, addressing, and presenting psychosocial issues in the workplace. Namely, encouraging open communication where all employees feel comfortable talking about the PSH will promote a positive PSC. Promoting a culture of communication where there is transparency, open dialogue, and a sense of belonging and commitment will lead to promoting a positive PSC.

5.1.4.3 Work design
Another critical factor some respondents usually face is unclear job demands and unreasonable goals while having time pressure. C3 (2023) expressed that they were close to burnout due to a high workload while missing a supportive leader that made clear priorities. Derdowski & Mathisen (2023) emphasize that work design is essential in promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate. This factor refers to how the work is structured and organized. The authors state that work design contains job control, demands, and support. The authors added that daily psychosocial hazards should be highlighted to ensure that employees have control over their work, can manage their workloads, and receive adequate support from their supervisors and colleagues, which was missing in the case of respondent C3. JDCS is one of the models developed by Karasek and Theorells (1990); this model examines the reasons that may affect well-being in the workplace. Hansson et al. (2009) claim that low control, high demand, and inadequate social support may result in negative health outcomes such as burnout, illness, and sick leave risks. Based on the statement above, if the workplace has a high work demand, then it is critical to have high job control and high social support to make it possible for the employees to cope with this high job demand. Namely, workplaces with a high work demand that needs too much effort from the employees
while having low control and the ability for the employees to affect their own work, as well as a weak supportive relationship among the employees, will lead to PSH. Therefore, it is possible to use the JDCS model to examine the psychosocial work environment and investigate the reasons affecting the employees' mental health and well-being. Thus, the empirical findings about work design align with the theoretical framework, demonstrating that work design factors, such as job control, demands, and social support, play a crucial role in promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate. The JDCS model provides a useful lens for understanding how these factors impact employees' well-being, emphasizing the need for high job control and support to mitigate the negative effects of high work demands.

5.1.4.4 Training and awareness
According to S2 (2023), the case company is developing an OSA course in collaboration with the Swedish Work Environment Authority; the OSA course will become the company’s standard in Sweden. Walters (2011) states that to mitigate the risk of psychosocial events, a collaboration between stakeholders, regulators, and industry associations is needed to address this issue. Therefore, the case company's collaboration with the Swedish Work Environment Authority in developing the OSA course aligns with the recommended approach by Walters (2011) of involving various stakeholders to mitigate the risk of psychosocial events.

The OSA course, which is in the planning phase and tested by L1 in department 1. This course will be offered to both leaders and co-workers and will include a theoretical part that will consider information, regulations, laws, and the recommended actions regarding OSA. It will also consist of a training part that contains group workshops and a survey to assess the psychosocial state within the department. After that, an action plan will be created based on the survey results to identify the psychosocial issues and, together with the departments’ teams, resolve these issues. This aligns with the theoretical framework presented by Houdmont and Leka (2010), which emphasizes that training and awareness are essential to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate since it provides the employees with an understanding of psychosocial safety and enables them to address and identify potential psychosocial hazards. The OSA course aims to ensure the engagement of all department members since each employee contributes actively to resolving their psychosocial concerns. This is in accordance with the theoretical framework proposed by Idris et al. (2015) that highlights that it is essential to provide training and education, increasing awareness of mental health and stress management. The authors state that this will create a more supportive workplace, as well as reduce the disgrace of mental health issues.

To sum up, increasing the awareness among the employees about psychosocial issues and educating them about different ways to manage psychosocial hazards is critical because when the employees have a better knowledge about psychosocial issues, laws, and how to manage psychosocial hazards, they will be more comfortable addressing, reporting, and trying to solve these hazards. The OSA course, which is about introducing psychosocial issues and helping different departments to identify various PSH and, together in the team, address and solve these problems, will help increase the employees' awareness and ensure everyone's involvement in solving the department's psychosocial risks.
5.1.4.5 Support, resources, and employee participation

The case company provides support and resources that help in having a positive psychosocial work environment, such as the accessibility of a health center (Falk), health coaches, and collaboration between the HR team, safety & work environment team, as well as the safety representatives. The management team in the case company has clear requirements and believes it is necessary to report all kinds of psychosocial risks (L1, 2023). The company has a dedicated system for reporting incidents and accidents where reports are kept confidential because they are sensitive; only HR can see them. The mentioned above evidence supports the case company's alignment with Dollard et al.'s (2019) emphasis on the importance of providing support and resources to help employees manage work-related stress and promote well-being. The authors stress that support and resources may include flexible work arrangements, access to health services, and counseling services. Access to health services and counseling services and counseling service is present; Falk and health coaches. On the other hand, there may be room for improvements in work arrangements, as C3 (2023) stated that the respondent wishes to have a hybrid work.

However, L1 (2023) and C1 (2023) highlighted some issues with reporting. They highlighted that some employees report psychosocial hazards as physical accidents, which makes it hard to identify the specific quantity of the reported psychosocial hazards. Many respondents pointed out that they only use this system to report physical accidents or critical psychosocial issues, even though L1 (2023) highlights that all types of psychosocial hazards should be reported to be able to proactively maintain psychosocial safety. L1 (2023) and S1 (2023) stated that it is the leaders' responsibility to follow these reports and try to resolve the issue together with the safety representatives and HR. However, C1 (2023) mentioned that even if they are the department that are responsible for the incidents and accidents system, they may not report all of the psychosocial hazards because the team tries to solve the problem together before it develops into a serious risk. On the other hand, studies such as Byrnes et al. (2022) highlight that organizations with a poor safety climate usually lack accident reporting because safety climate directly correlate with accidents. Furthermore, Dollard et al. (2019) state that the psychosocial safety climate theory highlights that the root cause of psychosocial hazards can be traced back to the organizational climate. Therefore, it can be discussed that there is a need to stress the importance of reporting psychosocial hazards for all employees.

According to the policy of health and work environment document, creating and maintaining a healthy and safe work environment requires continuous improvements. Thus, the company expects every employee to actively contribute to developing and maintaining a safe and healthy work environment to ensure the effective implementation of these policies. Therefore several systems are available such as safety rounds, the yearly survey Glint, the pilot system Guinea, and the pilot OSA course. The case company has initiatives that address the statement of Hu et al. (2022) that highlights the essential role of the employees’ participation in creating a positive PSC. The company verifies even the statement of the authors, who highlight that employee participation includes involving the employees in risk assessments, seeking their feedback, and engaging them in developing training and awareness programs.
This has been accomplished in the case company since they involve the employees in risk assessments through safety rounds, seek their feedback on the work environment through the mentioned surveys, and engage them in developing training and awareness programs through the upcoming OSA course. Moreover, the Hu et al. (2022) claim engaged employees are more likely to feel psychologically safe. Therefore, the authors spotlight that the employees should be encouraged to actively participate in formulating and implementing the policies and procedures that promote a positive PSC. However, the empirical findings provide no information about the direct involvement of the employees in the formulation of the policies.

Considering the above, the empirical findings about support and resources & employee participation align with the theoretical framework demonstrating several initiatives in promoting a positive PSC. Falk, health coaching, and collaboration between different departments within the company are the support and resources that may help in promoting a positive psychosocial work environment. The case company has as well a system to report the psychosocial hazards, which in turn may help in assessing and identifying the psychosocial risks in the workplace. However, there is potential for improvement, for instance, it is necessary to ensure that everyone at the company has knowledge about the importance of reporting the PSH. Given that, when the employees start to report the psychosocial hazards more, it will be easier to identify the potential PSH. Then it is the leaders' responsibility to follow these reports and refer to the existing supportive resources.

5.1.4.6 Leadership and management
The case company expects the managers to identify and improve occupational health and safety with the help of all employees, who should be encouraged to identify and report possible hazards and risks. The managers should also provide access to competent safety and health experts (company document, 2023). Furthermore, seven of eight respondents believe that leadership and management is the most important factor in promoting a positive psychosocial work environment. In contrast, one respondent (C1) claimed that it relies on the situation. All respondents believe that all employees are responsible for promoting a positive psychosocial work environment; hence it requires collaboration between leaders and co-workers. However, the respondents mentioned that the leaders have a greater responsibility since they need to engage all co-workers. The above-mentioned aligns with the claim of Manapragada et al. (2019) that emphasizes that leadership and management are key factors in promoting a safe psychosocial work environment since the managers are responsible for creating a safe and healthy environment. The authors add that it is essential for managers and leaders to be committed to promoting employee engagement and well-being, and work-life balance.

During different meetings, the employees highlighted the phrase "We are each other's work environment" (quarterly & safety rounds meetings, 2023). According to most respondents, employees may contribute to developing psychosocial safety by following the guidelines and code of conduct that show how to behave towards each other. Namely, the employees may contribute by helping each other, giving feedback, and being transparent (company document). Nonetheless, leaders should act as role models, and promote trust and a work
environment where the employees feel comfortable, creative, and open to sharing their opinions and ideas (most respondents and company documents). C3 (2023) highlights the importance of the leaders’ availability while facing a challenging work situation. Moreover, S1 (2023) and S2 (2023) emphasized the importance of promoting open communication, trust, and transparency regarding psychosocial issues; they also suggested that leaders should dedicate even a few minutes of their workday to checking the situation of the employees. This aligns with Manapragada et al.’s (2019) argument, which emphasizes that leaders should promote trust, open communication, and respect, act as role models, and establish policies and practices that promote positive psychosocial safety. Moreover, L1 (2023) highlighted that problems might arise without competent leadership, regardless of the department's situation. This aligns with the state of Dollard et al. (2019) which suggests that leaders who are competent in recognizing and managing psychosocial hazards may contribute to developing a positive work environment and improving employees’ well-being. Furthermore, L1 (2023) added that communication is a critical aspect; however, leadership is the key aspect because competent leaders have the ability to promote effective communication. This aligns with the assertion made by Gilbert and Lefebvres (2018), who claim to develop that psychosocial safety leaders are the ones who are responsible for promoting open communication.

Furthermore, L1 (2023) asserted that leaders are responsible for identifying the desired psychosocial work environment. The respondent argued that leaders may create a sense of involvement and foster a positive work environment by allowing the team members to voice their ideas, thoughts, and opinions. L1 (2023) added that these issues should be discussed during the check-in meetings or safety rounds to ensure everyone on the team is concerned about these issues. Based on the experience of L1 (2023), the team’s concerns turn out to be less significant when the issues are identified and discussed. This is verified once again by the claim of Gilbert and Lefebvres (2018) that emphasized leaders should promote open communication and create a space where employees have the opportunity to share their thoughts, concerns, and ideas, which may be fulfilled through individual meetings, regular team meetings, and anonymous surveys. The authors added that it is the leaders that should provide support and help the employees who have exposed psychosocial hazards or any other personal problems by providing needed resources, access to counseling, as well as flexible work agreements. Another aspect the authors highlighted is the leader’s responsibility is to celebrate and recognize the achievements of their team members and reward them, which may lead to a more positive workplace environment and boost morale. Thereby, leadership and management impact all critical factors promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate.

Drawing from the analysis and discussion made in section 5.1.4 including the subheadings supportive policies, effective communication, work design, training & awareness, support and resources, employee participation, and leadership and management should be considered to manage the PSH and promote a positive PSC. While the current level of psychosocial safety was generally rated positively by seven out of eight respondents due to increased interest in psychosocial concerns and the implementation of regulations, improvements are still necessary to achieve a truly positive psychosocial work environment. Most respondents highlighted that it is essential to have various aspects of developing psychosocial safety, such
as open discussions and dialogue, involvement, clear work tasks, active listening, providing support, providing the required resources, and prioritizing employees' concerns. However, both literature and respondents agreed that leadership and management is the key factor of developing the PSC, which in turn affects other aspects mentioned to promote PSC (see Figure 3). It is the leaders' responsibility to ensure that there are supportive policies that contribute to promoting a positive PSC. Furthermore, it is also the leaders' responsibility to promote an open dialogue and effective communication to ensure that the employees feel free to talk about psychosocial issues and report them. Additionally, the leader is able to create an open climate by addressing the psychosocial hazards and talking more about them, requiring the employees to report the psychosocial hazard, and providing the required resources, training, and awareness to ensure that everyone is aware of the PSC and engaged in developing the PSC. The leader can also provide a reasonable work design that matches the employees' abilities and competencies.

![Figure 3: Factors that contribute to a positive PSC (own construction)](image)

### 5.1.5 Leadership styles and behaviors

When the respondents were asked whether there is a specific leadership style that promotes psychosocial safety, they believed that each situation requires different leadership styles, some situations require delegating leadership styles that are delegating, and other situations require authoritarian leadership. According to them, there is not one leadership style that is suitable for promoting psychosocial safety, but it depends on the situation and also on the
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maturity level of the group. The above mentioned is evident in the theoretical claim too, where different authors propose different styles as effective in promoting psychosocial safety. For example, Lewis et al. (2012) suggest that transformational leadership is the most suitable style to improve psychosocial safety. Gilbert and Lefebvre (2018) suggest a combination of both transactional and transformational leadership to promote a positive psychosocial environment. However, Densten (2005) claims that transformational leadership might trigger burnout because of ‘‘visionary behavior’’. Skakon et al. (2010) state that some studies find no connection between transactional leadership and employees’ well-being, some studies indicate lower stress and burnout, and others suggest potential job dissatisfaction. It can be ascertained that there is no obvious leadership style that is the most suitable for promoting a positive PSC, it may depend on the context and a combination of both transactional and transformational leadership styles may be used.

However, when the respondents were asked about leaders’ behaviors that promote psychosocial safety, they provided very different answers. Only behaviors supported by the theory will be included in the analysis below. Many respondents highlighted the behavior of being supportive and involved. The behavior of being supportive, involved, and available is partly comparable with transformational leadership that empowers individuals through resource allocation, task delegation, and promoting job satisfaction and overall well-being (Lewis et al., 2012). Workload management is another important behavior mentioned by C3, which is a crucial behavior in the transactional style mentioned by Bass (1999) and Bass & Riggio (2006). Transparency and trust were another behavior mentioned by S2 & S1, which is comparable with leader-member exchange LXM which is considered suitable for fostering a positive work environment and employee well-being (Zhu et al., 2023; Gilbert & Lefebvre, 2018). The authors highlight the importance of relationship quality between leaders and co-workers; then, a high relationship quality leads to increased job satisfaction and more effective achievement of organizational goals. The authors add that a high relationship quality implied high communication, mutual trust, loyalty, respect, and higher job satisfaction among the team members. In consideration of this, behaviors of being supportive and involved are two of the transformational leadership style behaviors, available and dividing workload, which is transactional leadership style behaviors, as well as transparency and trust, which may be promoted by having a high relationship quality between leaders and co-workers. These leadership behaviors are considered contributing factors to a leadership style that promotes psychosocial safety. No concrete conclusions can be drawn on the styles, but a combination of these three leadership styles may be beneficial; transformational, transactional, and LXM. It can also be concluded that each style is suitable depending on the situation and the maturity level of the working group.

5.1.6 Reviewing the department's psychosocial status

The psychosocial safety climate in the three examined departments will be compared based on critical factors highlighted by Dollard et al. (2019) and Houdmont and Leka (2010) to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate. The factors are effective communication, work design, training and awareness, support, resources and employee participation, and
leadership and management. All factors besides supportive policies will be discussed since the case company has the same policies for all departments. The case company has supportive policies that promote a positive PSC, therefore it is highlighted in green (see Table 3).

Note: this section does not include analysis or direct comparisons with the theoretical framework but only a discussion based on factors mentioned by Dollard et al. (2019) and Houdmont and Leka (2010). For analysis on the factors read section 5.1.4.

Department 1
This department appears to have a higher level of psychosocial safety compared to the other two departments. The department has effective communication among the department team members due to the Guinea pilot that is used by L1 (2023); through this system, the department’s employees communicate daily and address different risks, including psychosocial risks. Training and awareness regarding psychosocial safety is addressed in department 1 with the help of the OSA pilot that has been used by L1. Furthermore, the OSA pilot has even helped in improving the work design for the employees since the employees suggested different solutions for the existing psychosocial risks, one of them related to work design. Furthermore, C1 (2023) expressed that conducting the survey and the discussions were beneficial, resulting in a better understanding of what should be done to improve psychosocial safety. A certain degree of stress is present, but it is within manageable limits (C1, 2023). L1 (2023) encourages the employees at department 1 to be engaged in psychosocial safety work since they are assured that they utilize all available resources and systems at the moment (Glint and safety rounds) and are testing the pilot ones (Guinea and OSA course). Despite a pretty good psychosocial situation, they may not report all psychosocial hazards since they try to solve problems within the team before it develops into severe risk (C1, 2023). The leader in the department, L1 (2023), emphasized the importance of reporting all types of psychosocial hazards for the proactive prevention of psychosocial risks. The statement can be reinforced by the theoretical background where Byrnes et al. (2022) state that organizations that exhibit a weak safety climate show a lack of accident reporting.

Drawing from the discussion above, L1 is trying to promote open communication by using Guinea, providing awareness and training by using OSA course, trying to have a reasonable work design by also using OSA course, and engaging the employees in both finding the solutions and the risk assessments by providing the needed resources such as safety rounds. Therefore all factors are highlighted in green (see Table 3).

Department 2
Department 2 ranks second in terms of psychosocial safety, where both the leader and the co-worker pointed out the excessive stress they have been experiencing. Moreover, other problems that have been highlighted are having unclear expectations, unreasonable goals, time pressure, and unclear priorities from the management, which are related to the factor of work design. Therefore the factor work design is highlighted in yellow (see Table 3). Furthermore, ineffective communication between departments working on the same project
was addressed, which highlighted the factor of communication in yellow (see Table 3). Contrariwise, the communication is relatively good among the department’s employees (L2, C2, 2023). However, this department works with projects, and C2 (2023) conveyed that some project goals may be unrealistic. Therefore, the respondent suggested discussing with the management team to be able to prioritize when the requirements are too high. L2 provides different resources and is trying to increase awareness among co-workers regarding the psychosocial work environment by providing different lectures about stress and stress management, therefore the factor of awareness is highlighted in green (see Table 3). However, nothing has been mentioned about how L2 involves and engages the employees in improving psychosocial safety, and nothing about safety rounds. Therefore, the support, resources, and employee participation factor is highlighted in yellow (see Table 3). The attempts of L2 to improve psychosocial safety were many; department meetings, improvement group meetings, monthly check-ins, improvement group days, project meetings, and escalation meetings. Nonetheless, the issue of stress remains partially unresolved. Consequently, L2 is investigating agile working methods that imply working in shorter cycles and being flexible in response to changing demands. This might, in turn, generate more frequent and effective communication, a more flexible work design, and reduce psychosocial risks that may appear due to unreasonable goals and time pressure. However, there is no theoretical evidence that can assert that this working method is effective and this topic has not been investigated. According to C2 (2023) and L2 (2023), L2 is trying to develop the psychosocial work environment for the co-workers by doing several initiatives. It was noticed that L2 is available and addressing the psychosocial concerns and trying to find solutions for the team's concerns with the team. The factor of leadership and management is highlighted in light green (see Table 3), not because of negative behaviors specifically related to the department’s leader. However, leadership and management impact other mentioned factors, and some of them are highlighted in yellow, for instance effective communication, work design and support, resources and employee participation, which in turn lowers the rating of the factor leadership and management.

**Department 3**
Department 3 experiences the most significant psychosocial challenges emphasized by L3 (2023) but primarily by C3 (2023). Work overload, ambiguity in work organization, and ineffective communication among collaborating departments are the most present problems affecting the department's psychosocial safety. When it comes to improving initiatives to enhance psychosocial safety, L3 is trying to improve communication and engage the employees by having weekly individual meetings. The leader has done individual meetings with around 75% of the department and has tried to address the biggest problems in the department by checking tasks and role descriptions for the employees and also by hiring new staff to reduce the workload. On the other hand, C3 (2023) thinks it requires meetings that involve all the department employees to discuss the existing issues and solve them together. The respondent stated that no significant psychosocial change occurred since the meeting with the psychologist, but the only noticeable difference is the lower workload. Considering the situation mentioned above, it can be noticed that there is a lack of communication between the department's leader and co-workers, and they have not yet developed the work
design that the employees need. Hence, the communication factor is highlighted in red (see Table 3) because it was noticed that the communication is ineffective both amongst department 3 and other collaborating departments. The factor of work design is highlighted in yellow (see Table 3) due to dissatisfaction expressed by C3 (2023). Furthermore, the participation factor is highlighted in yellow (see Table 3) because the leader is trying to engage the employees, but only in individual meetings.

The resources and support provided for department 3 when the employees were close to burnout was a meeting with a psychologist. The psychologist's help was just a meeting where he/she analyzed the department's situation; however, there was a lack of follow-up (C3, 2023). Another problematic aspect in the department is the leadership and management, as C3 (2023) highlighted the absence of the previous leader (not L3), as well as the lack of support of the leader during the department's challenging period. The previous leader of department 3 showed no concern for the psychosocial problems and failed to address the issues (C3, 2023). Furthermore, C3 (2023) mentioned that there are company policies regarding the psychosocial work environment, but these policies have not been presented or discussed during department meetings. Evaluating the answers of C3 (2023), it can be realized that the lack of subsequent follow-up after the psychologist's meeting, poor leadership, and lack of discussion about psychosocial policies have been the psychosocial concerns of department 3. When it comes to the effectiveness of the initiatives taken and changes under process to solve the problem of work overload and ambiguity, they have not shown remarkable results yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supportive policies</th>
<th>Effective communication</th>
<th>Work design</th>
<th>Training &amp; awareness</th>
<th>Support, resources and employee participation</th>
<th>Leadership and management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The psychosocial safety climate of department 1, department 2, and department 3 is being compared where: green indicates a psychosocial safety climate above average, yellow represents an average psychosocial safety climate and red indicates a psychosocial safety climate below average. (own construction)
5.2 Change Management

5.2.1 Introduction to change management

"Change or die" is a statement that indicates the importance of change in order to survive as an organization (Hallin et al., 2021, p. 13). L1 had a relatively similar view of change when the respondent stated that “When I talk about change management with my team, I tell them that there is only one thing that is constant in our existence, and that is change.” (L1, 2023) which indicates that change is always present and effectively managing change is crucial to succeeding. All respondents agreed on the importance of change and expressed similar viewpoints on why it is important; for the company's survival, competitiveness, and overall attractiveness in the market. The importance of change is also recognized in the case company and encouraged (L3, 2023). One such practice is referred to as "the improvement of the month" which is an example that shows encouragement in the case of a company.

While change is so common, change management is essential to help achieve a change's goal (Price & Chahal, 2006). While in theory, change is defined as follows: "A deliberate set of activities that facilitate and support the success of individual and organizational change and the realization of its intended business results" (Hallin et al., 2021, p. 17), the case company presents change as a process of a thing moving from a state to a state that is considered better (company document, 2023). Although the case company's definition gives a general understanding of change, both definitions view the concept of change as a shift from one state to another and that the end state is considered better or an improvement compared to the first one. Moreover, they acknowledge that change is purposeful and intentional, whether achieved through planned activities or through a process. It can even be concluded that developing psychosocial safety climate is considered a change according to both definitions since it is a shift from a state to a better one, and the development is intentional.

According to Hallin et al. (2021), driving forces behind organizational change can be external, internal, or both external & internal. PESTEL is a model that analyzes external factors that impact organizations, and it represents political, economic, sociocultural, technological, environmental, and legal change factors. The respondents’ answers indicated that the driving forces behind developing psychosocial safety are both internal and external. The internal factor mentioned is economic gain meaning that enhancing employee well-being positively (S2, C1, L1, 2023), for example it may affect the overall company performance as mentioned by one of the respondents. Regarding external factors, social norms & values, and legislations were noted as change drivers (S2, L1, 2023). These can be categorized as sociocultural and legal change factors, as Hallin et al. (2021) state.

5.2.2 Change management to develop psychosocial safety

By following the steps mentioned below, organizations can systematically address psychosocial safety concerns, promote employee well-being, and create a positive and supportive work environment.
5.2.2.1 Planning for change

In the theoretical framework, it is highlighted that three activities are important building blocks in the planning phase (Hallin et al., 2021). The activities are formulating the impact goals, analyzing conditions for change, and creating a communication plan (Hallin et al., 2021). While formulating the impact goals, they should be quantifiable, meaningful, and communicated in a way that effectively engages the organization's employees, highlighting the reasons for change, the importance of achieving the impact goals, and the urgency of the situation (Hallin et al., 2021; Kotter & Cohen, 2012). C1 (2023) mentioned being clear about the goal of change as a crucial aspect in the planning phase, which is comparable with the goal being quantifiable. L1 (2023) provided a specific example of communicating in a way that effectively engages the organization's employees. The respondent mentioned the "what is in it for me" (L1, 2023) approach highlighting personal benefits for the individuals involved. However, measuring psychosocial safety is not so easy but can be linked to long-term sick leaves, burnout, or the survey Glint (S2, 2023).

It can be considered that if developing psychosocial safety was regarded as a change, then the first step would be to have quantifiable and meaningful goals. Although measuring psychosocial safety is not as easy as measuring physical safety (L1, S1, S2, 2023), S2 (2023) argued that sick leaves and burnout are signs of an unfavorable psychosocial safety environment. They can be the indicators that change is needed. Moreover, Hallin et al. (2021) state that employee surveys indicating dissatisfaction can be a driver for change. It can be argued that using Glint, reporting and lifting psychosocial risks, even small ones, can facilitate the assessment of the current level of safety. This can, in turn, help to have measurable goals. Measurable goals provide a basis for monitoring progress and evaluating the effectiveness of actions that aim to develop psychosocial safety. Moreover, establishing a state of readiness for change is vital (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Many respondents highlighted that acknowledging 'why the change is needed' is one of the primary actions. This is in line with Cameron & Quinn's (2011) statement that it is crucial to foster an understanding of the advantages that the future state offers of change and acknowledge the disadvantages of maintaining the current situation. Moreover, it can be discussed that while communicating the rationale for change, employing the "what is in it for me" (L1, 2023) approach can be beneficial.

Analyzing conditions for change includes developing a more comprehensive understanding of the change, its impact on individuals, and the preferred pace that can be incremental, radical, or continuous (By, 2005; Hallin et al., 2021). Incremental and continuous changes tend to stick better than radical ones (By, 2005). When L1 (2023) represents a change, he/she represents it as an improvement, meaning radical change is uncommon. L2 (2023), S1 (2023), and S2 (2023) encouraged the idea of taking small steps because rushing through them or taking bigger steps is unlikely to be effective. Even C1 (2023) and S1 (2023) mentioned that what characterizes cultural change is that it requires time which they presented as a challenge. Based on the analysis in section 5.1.1 (The impact of work environment on the employees), it can be inferred that the case company has an understanding of the change and its impact on individuals. They understand that change in developing
psychosocial safety has a crucial impact on individuals and will positively affect their mental health and well-being, resulting in a more productive workforce. Regarding the change phase, it can be argued that developing psychosocial safety is regarded as an incremental and continuous change. Despite the slow pace of change, incremental change is considered less challenging as it enables employees to adapt to the change in a more manageable manner, thereby increasing the likelihood of its success (Hallin et al., 2021).

Finally, creating a communication plan encompasses the change message, the communication channels to be used, the communication frequency, and the individuals responsible for communication (Hallin et al., 2021). Multiple communication channels and different forms of communication are recommended, such as words and pictures (Lewis et al., 2006; Rafferty et al., 2013). S1 expressed a similar view on communication plans as the one mentioned in the theoretical framework. The respondent suggested using different channels, focused on visual tools, and gave specific examples of digital displays and boards. S1, in line with the theoretical framework presented by Lewis et al. (2006), stresses the importance of maintaining consistent communication throughout all phases of the change, even after implementation, to reinforce its impact. The respondent also highlighted the importance of visual representation while communicating the change. Storytelling is widely recognized as an influential method for conveying the message of change (Hallin et al., 2021). L1 supported this notion and found storytelling an effective tool as the respondent stated that by leading through storytelling, the team members can have a comprehensive view and act independently according to the department’s story, which makes them more involved in the process of developing psychosocial safety. S1’s suggestion with visual representation and L1’s suggestion with storytelling is similar to Kotter & Cohen’s (2012) statement that successful changes do not follow the "analyze-think-change" pattern but instead follow the "see-feel-change" sequence which evokes an emotional response. Consequently, using communication channels, visual representation, and storytelling can help effectively communicate the message of the change i.e why developing psychosocial safety is beneficial.

5.2.2.2 Implementing change
The activities of raising awareness and strengthening engagement are fundamental during the second phase of the change journey (Hallin et al., 2021). This was confirmed during the interviews since some examples were given on activities that contribute to raising awareness and strengthening engagement; specific examples will be given below. The empirical findings support the theoretical framework, as Hallin et al. (2021) argue that raising awareness in organizations involves education and training, which is in line with the suggestion of Cameron and Quinn (2011) that organizations can potentially adopt a systematic training strategy when initiating a cultural change. S2 emphasized the importance of knowledge during change implementation and provided a specific example, highlighting the use of workshops. In the case of developing psychosocial safety, the OSA course can be considered beneficial since it includes information, regulations, laws, and the recommended actions regarding OSA as well as group workshops and a survey. Furthermore, Cameron and Quinn (2011) emphasize that education and training should exist at every level within the organization and should be adapted to the needs of every department/individual. Education
and training improve the implementation of change since it enhances individuals' involvement and readiness (Errida & Lotfi, 2021). Since the change of developing psychosocial safety regards the whole case organization, it can be argued that departments 2 and 3 can adapt the training courses, such as the upcoming OSA course, to raise awareness about psychosocial aspects among the employees.

When it comes to strengthening engagement, practicing communication is a crucial activity and outlines four dimensions of practicing effective communication: timing, clear messages, active listening, and feedback (Hallin et al., 2021). The authors also state that the start of a transformational journey may not provide complete clarity on every detail; leaders must still involve employees early in the process. Leaders should also communicate decisively with employees, sharing what has been decided and what is still pending, and actively engage them in an open dialogue. C1 (2023) and C2 (2023) confirmed the theoretical framework as they highlighted the need to involve everyone affected by the change early in the process. Furthermore, C1 (2023) highlighted the importance of being clear with the goal of change, C1 (2023) underscored the significance of communication & open dialogue, and C3 (2023) drew attention to the value of offering feedback during the change process. In accordance with the analysis, the OSA course and Guinea can be considered a solution that effectively addresses the problems of the psychosocial work environment since it provides an opportunity for active listening and feedback and enhances communication.

5.2.2.3 Reinforcing change
As C2 stated, the reinforcing phase of change has been a challenge for several change initiatives in the case company. It can therefore be argued that there is a need to pay extra attention to this phase while developing a psychosocial safety climate. Consolidating behaviors and evaluating are the main activities in the last phase of change (Hallin et al., 2021). Consolidating behaviors can be done by rewarding and acknowledging desired behavior. The importance of reinforcing change was brought up in the interviews as C1 (2023) mentioned that developing psychosocial safety is a continuous process and therefore needs to be followed up continuously. The theoretical claims of consolidating behaviors by acknowledging them were supported in the empirical findings since many respondents highlighted the importance of having several specific initiatives that consolidate behaviors. For example, maintaining ongoing dialogue (S1, 2023), repeatedly bringing up the change topic, which is developing psychosocial safety (many respondents), and follow-up (C3, 2023).

In the theoretical framework, different ways of rewarding systems are brought up. One of them is celebrating successes and milestones (Hallin et al., 2021). The empirical findings align with the theoretical framework since a large majority of the respondents concurred that the attainment of change deserves celebration. Concerning external rewards, specifically money, was discussed during the interviews. As the theoretical framework marks that some individuals respond positively to external rewards (Härtel & Fujimoto, 2015), one respondent provided validation (L3, 2023) who was at least not against money as a reward. However, according to Härtel & Fujimoto (2015), certain individuals do not perceive a significant
influence on their performance because of money as a reward, and Gagné and Deci (2005) note that it can even inhibit the employees’ performance. Even this theoretical claim was verified by the respondents. S2 (2023) and L3 (2023) thought that money could have a negative effect on reinforcing change, S1 (2023) mentioned collective activities as a suggestion on reward, and L1 (2023) mentioned that the effect of money is short-lived, may lead to dissatisfaction and that the most effective reward system is when individuals recognize their role within a broader context. Consequently, L1 argued that individuals might understand the broad context through storytelling. It can be concluded that acknowledging and rewarding desired behaviors related to psychosocial safety development help reinforce the development of it. Celebrating successes and milestones in promoting psychosocial safety motivates individuals to sustain their commitment to creating a safe workplace. However, internal drivers are very helpful, but money is a less effective reward (at least when not combined with other rewards) and can even have a negative impact on reinforcing a change.

Additionally, (Hallin et al., 2021) regular evaluation of the change progress is crucial to assess whether adjustments to the plan are necessary. This is validated by the statement of L1 (2023), highlighting the necessity to address and evaluate how the change is progressing at each milestone. L2 (2023) further emphasized the valuable opportunity to adjust during the change process. Thereby, it can be argued that implementing strategies such as Glint, safety rounds, and improved reporting mechanisms can effectively assess the progress made in developing psychosocial safety and adjust the plan if needed.
6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of this study is to investigate the psychosocial safety climate in a manufacturing organization in Sweden. Identifying the critical factors to develop the psychosocial safety climate can provide insights into how managers can work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate, hence achieving the goal of a well-functioning psychosocial work climate. It also aims to fill the research gap by considering the development of psychosocial safety climate as a change and viewing how change management may help develop it. The aim leads to the following research questions:

- How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate?
- How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate?

The first question: How can organizations work to promote a positive psychosocial safety climate?

To promote a positive psychosocial climate organizations should foster these factors: supportive policies, training & awareness, effective communication, support, resources & the employees participation, a reasonable work design, and leadership & management.

Leadership and management is the key factor in promoting a positive PSC, because leaders have a significant impact on the mentioned factors. Leaders should begin by promoting supportive policies and straightforward procedures that support promoting a positive PSC. The second step is to identify and assess the psychosocial hazards that impact the team and identify the root causes of these psychosocial hazards, and this may be done by risk assessments and employee feedback which in turn require effective communication. Therefore, it is essential to promote effective communication and open dialogue regarding psychosocial issues and encourage the employees to report psychosocial hazards because it is as significant as the physical ones. In order to make everyone in the team willing to share their opinions and problems, it is essential to promote trust by having a high relationship quality among the leaders and employees. Leaders should lead by the situation since there is no obvious suitable leadership style to promote a positive PSC.

However, leaders should ensure the participation and involvement of the employees since it is an essential factor in promoting a positive PSC; this could be done by providing feedback opportunities, promoting open communication, and encouraging the employees to participate in the decision-making process. Leaders should also foster open communication that promotes a sense of meaning and a sense of involvement. By having effective communication and open dialogue, the leaders may assess the work design of their co-workers. When employees have a high workload, then it is essential for the leaders to be available and support the team, as well as giving them a higher ability to control and plan their work. However, a balance between task delegating and supportive leadership behaviors is required when employees are facing a high workload. In addition, it is essential for the leaders to provide the required resources, such as referring to health coaches to help the employees with stress management or referring to a healthcare center when it is a severe psychosocial issue.
Moreover, leaders should provide training and increase awareness to ensure that the employees are aware of PSC and the company's policies and procedures regarding it.

The second question: How can change management possibly help to develop a psychosocial safety climate?

Developing psychosocial safety is considered a change according to both the literature and the company's definition since both involve an intentional shift from one state to a better one, focusing on enhancing well-being and psychological safety. The change management process for developing psychosocial safety is divided into three phases: planning for change, implementing change, and reinforcing change with necessary actions in each phase.

In the phase of planning for change, formulating the impact goals, analyzing conditions for change, and creating a communication plan are three essential steps. The impact goal of developing psychosocial safety needs to be measurable, meaningful and conveyed to the employees in a manner that describes how this change will impact them positively, for example, by using the "what is in it for me approach" (L1, 2023). Furthermore, in order to have a measurable goal, reporting and lifting psychosocial risks are essential. When analyzing the conditions for change, it is crucial to cultivate a more profound comprehension of developing the psychosocial safety itself, for example, its effects on individuals and the desired pace of implementation. Developing psychosocial safety affects individuals impacting the employees' mental health, well-being, and productivity. This development will also impact the organizations because when having a more productive workforce, then it would be less challenging to achieve the organizations' goals. Moreover, a suitable pace is an incremental/continuous change because it sticks better in the organization and ensures positive psychosocial safety. Creating a communication plan entails defining the change message, communication channels, and the frequency of communication. Storytelling can work as an effective method to communicate why developing psychosocial safety is beneficial and to tell how to achieve this goal.

In the phase of implementing change, raising awareness and strengthening engagement are considered fundamental activities. Raising awareness, among other things, is done by a systematic training strategy to enhance knowledge about psychosocial aspects among the employees. Strengthening engagement can be done by training communication, which entails clear messages, active listening, and feedback, among other things. Leaders should engage in clear and decisive communication with colleagues, ensuring that decisions made and pending matters are shared transparently. It is crucial to actively involve them in an open dialogue in order to engage the employees in developing psychosocial safety. Since developing psychosocial safety is a continuous change, reinforcing this change is an essential step. In the phase of reinforcing change, consolidating behaviors and evaluating the development of psychosocial safety are two main activities. Recognizing and rewarding positive behaviors associated with the development of psychosocial safety plays a vital role in reinforcing its progress. Celebrating achievements and milestones in developing the psychosocial safety climate serves as a motivation for individuals to maintain their dedication to fostering a
psychosocial safe workplace. However, it is essential to note that while internal drivers are highly beneficial, monetary rewards alone may be less effective in reinforcing change and may even have a negative impact.

6.2 Recommendations for case company

➢ Leaders should have an understanding of psychosocial safety, its implications, laws, and regulations. Moreover, the leaders should create a common understanding of psychosocial safety for the employees, to also address the company’s policies and procedures regarding it. Therefore, the upcoming OSA course will be beneficial in creating a common understanding of psychosocial aspects.

➢ The case company may acknowledge the importance of reporting the psychosocial hazards for all employees to actively detect and address the psychosocial issues, which in turn may help in developing psychosocial safety. Namely, reporting minor psychosocial hazards contributes to proactively promoting positive psychosocial work environment. Reporting the psychosocial hazards contributes to defining measurable goals that is an important aspect while the change of developing psychosocial safety.

➢ Identifying and addressing the psychosocial hazards may be done by using Glint, safety rounds and the upcoming OSA course. However, some improvements in the safety rounds survey may be done. To begin with, a bank of questions that only considers the psychosocial work environment is recommended, sequently this part of the survey may include the existing questions (see appendix 8.3, (section 3- work conditions)) and other questions such as the recommended below:

Psychosocial safety

- Do the employees feel that they have a safe psychosocial work environment?
- Do the employees have a manageable workload and the ability to affect their work design?
- Do the employees feel that they have been provided with the resources that are required to manage the psychosocial risks?
- Are the employees aware of the available resources and support for maintaining mental well-being and managing stress?
- Does the department have an open dialogue and feel comfortable discussing psychosocial concerns?
- Does the leader highlight psychosocial issues during meetings?
- Do the employees have the ability to take breaks to recharge?
- Do the employees consider communication as open and effective within their team, department, and across the organization?

➢ Promoting effective communication and open dialogue is essential both between individuals within different departments as well as amongst the department’s employees and leaders. Encouraging open dialogue and effective communication amongst the department’s employees and leaders can be done by using Guinea.
When facing a challenging situation, it is essential to have a department meeting/group meeting with all employees to address and discuss the psychosocial concerns and together find possible solutions.

The upcoming OSA course will be beneficial in addressing the psychosocial hazards in each department; it will also help in engaging all department employees as well as leaders to solve the psychosocial concerns together. However, following up on the results after this course is critical in maintaining a positive psychosocial work environment.

To reinforce the development of psychosocial safety, it is crucial to celebrate success and reward desired behaviors to consolidate them. Those serve as a motivation for individuals to maintain their dedication to fostering a psychosocial safe workplace.

6.3 Suggestion for future research

This report examines the psychosocial safety climate in departments consisting of office-based personnel. For future research, a recommended approach would be conducting interviews with individuals working in production work environments. Another recommendation is to examine the psychosocial safety climate across different demographic groups, for example, between men and women or older and younger individuals, to acquire valuable insights into the impact of different demographic factors on outcomes. Moreover, another recommendation is to examine diverse industries. In this report, examining the psychosocial climate in the manufacturing industry was in focus. In future research other industries, such as education and healthcare, can be investigated to provide valuable insights into how organizational contexts influence psychosocial safety. Lastly, since this study has not considered the challenges that leaders may face when promoting a positive psychosocial safety climate, therefore it is recommended to examine the aspect. The recommendations mentioned above can contribute to providing more nuanced findings, get a more thorough comprehension of the analysis, enhance the generalizability of the results, and get a more thorough understanding of the subject of psychosocial safety climate.
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8. APPENDIX

8.1 Appendix 1  

Interview guide  

1. What does a psychosocially safe work environment mean to you?  
2. Is there a type/ types of leadership that favors a psychologically safe climate while also considering other important factors such as financial performance and productivity?  
3. What are the critical factors that create a psychosocially safe environment?  
4. How is psychosocial risk assessment carried out at the company to find out how serious the psychosocial risks are? How often is it done?  
5. How do you handle a psychosocial risk, for example if one of your team members feels discriminated against or not included in the group?  
6. What is the biggest challenge you have experienced regarding mental health conditions, stress, threats, violence or any other psychosocial factor. How have you dealt with it? what was the result? what did you learn?  
7. You mentioned earlier that the psychosocial working climate was not as good as it is now in your team? What changes did you make to create a good psychosocial work climate in your team?  
8. Could you share with us a comprehensive overview of the detailed steps you, and other leaders and employees, took to successfully initiate, execute, and maintain a change? We are interested in learning about your detailed approach to planning, implementation, and maintaining a change in order to achieve the desired outcomes.  
9. How did other leaders and employees make change processes easier/difficult?  
10. According to the theoretical framework, the work conditions that cause psychosocial risks are workplaces with overwhelming workloads, unclear job responsibilities or contradictory demands, limited abilities to make decisions, and insufficient control over job duties (Hupke, 2022). Hupke (2022) has also mentioned that these work conditions may also include ineffective communication and lack of support from coworkers or managers, handling job insecurity and organizational change incompetently, as well as violence from outside sources including sexual and psychological harassment. Which factor do you think plays the greatest role in increasing the likelihood of psychosocial risk?  
11. Do you think that Covid-19 has had an impact on the psychosocial work environment? Have you had several sick leave due to psychosocial factors during the pandemic?  
12. To what extent are the employees and managers familiar with the concept of psychosocial factors? Do you believe it is essential for everyone to have knowledge of this concept?  
13. Do you believe that the responsibility for creating a positive psychosocial work environment lies solely with the leaders? If not, who else do you think shares this responsibility?
14. "In theory, there are numerous change management models, such as ADKAR, PROSCI, Kotter's, Lewin's, or McKinsey's models, each with its own literature that includes both praise and criticism. How do you perceive the practicality of using models in general? Do you have a preferred model for implementing change, particularly when addressing psychosocial factors?"

15. Is there something special that leaders often forget but you think is important when implementing changes, especially changes that have to do with psychosocial factors?

8.1 Appendix 2

Revised interview guide & ethical considerations

Ethical considerations
- [ ] Respondents informed about the purpose of the study
- [ ] Respondents informed that they can freely decide whether or not to participate in the interviews, and have the right to withdraw without any negative consequences.
- [ ] Respondents informed that their participation is anonymous
- [ ] Respondents informed that recording the interview to transcribe is okay

About you
- Name
- Years in the organization
- Current department
- Current job title
- Job tasks and responsibilities

Psychosocial Safety

1. How do you think the work environment affects employees' mental health, well-being, and productivity?
2. What does a safe work environment mean to you?
3. How do you think technology and remote work impact psychosocial safety and employee well-being?
4. Can you explain your understanding of psychosocial safety?
5. How do you identify psychosocial hazards in the workplace?
6. What factors do you think impact employee well-being in the workplace?
7. Have you ever experienced a psychosocial risk at work? How did you handle it, and did you receive any support from your company?
8. If you/ an employee feels stressed, discriminated against, or excluded from a group, how would you handle the situation?
9. What do you think are the critical factors in creating a psychosocially safe workplace environment? How can we develop psychosocial safety in the workplace, and do companies tend to forget critical things to consider in this process?
10. In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges to developing psychosocial safety in the workplace?
11. Are you and your colleagues aware of the meaning of psychosocial safety and the company’s policies regarding it?
12. The literature mentions certain factors … that are critical for developing psychosocial safety. What are your thoughts on these factors? (The factors will be disclosed during the interview to prevent any potential influence on your response to question 8.)
13. Who is responsible for developing psychosocial safety and employee well-being in the workplace?
14. Do you think employees have a role in creating a psychosocially safe workplace environment? If so, what can they do to contribute?
15. How should leaders behave/act to contribute in developing the psychosocial safety and employee well-being?
16. What type of leader can balance the importance of psychosocial safety with other factors like financial performance and productivity?
17. What is the biggest challenge for you as a leader when promoting positive psychosocial safety? (just for the leaders respondents)
18. Can you share examples of successful interventions or initiatives that your organization has implemented to improve psychosocial safety?

Change management

1. How do you define change management, and why is it important?
2. What is your understanding of organizational culture, and what characterizes change management of organizational culture?
3. What is the driving force behind changing and improving psychosocial safety culture in your organization: internal drivers, external drivers, or both?
4. Can you share an example of a cultural change you have been a part of or know about?
5. Can you walk us through how you/ your organization planned for, implemented, and maintained the cultural change?
6. What were the advantages and disadvantages of your organization's approach to change management?
7. Have you been part of a successful change initiative? If yes, please share your experience.
8. Can you share examples of initiatives that have failed, and what were the reasons for their failure?
9. What are the most common challenges that your organizations/ organizations face when implementing changes related to psychosocial safety and employee well-being?
10. How would you rate the current level of psychosocial safety in your workplace, and what aspects are positive?
11. How do you contribute to developing a psychosocial work environment, and how do your colleagues contribute? What can you do to improve?
12. What is your vision for the ideal psychosocially safe workplace? What changes do you think are necessary to improve psychosocial safety in your workplace?

13. How do you think your organization can achieve the ideal psychosocially safe workplace meaning how should your organization plan, implement, and reinforce these changes that you think are necessary to improve psychosocial safety?

14. How can leaders and managers ensure that employees are engaged and committed to changes related to psychosocial safety and employee well-being?

15. How can your organization/organizations ensure that changes related to psychosocial safety are sustainable and long-lasting?

16. How do you measure the effectiveness of changes related to psychosocial safety and employee well-being, and what metrics do you use?

17. What do you think are the critical factors in creating a psychosocially safe workplace environment, and how can organizations work to implement and maintain the changes needed to create such a culture?

18. Do you have something to add?
8.3 Appendix 3

Safety round Office – Organizational

Name
Safety round Office – Organizational

Description or instruction
1. Implementation (remember to save regularly)
   a. Answer yes or no to the points in the checklist, some checkpoints have comments as tooltips.
   b. If the answer is no, comment
   c. If the answer is no, add a measure by clicking on the wrench and describe the measure
   d. Click on done at the top under the “Implementation” tab

2. Follow-up
   a. Follow up that the measure has had the desired effect (eliminated all. risk reduced)
   b. Checkmark carried out measures
   c. Checkmark safety round
   d. Check that you get a gold star in the system, only then is the round complete.

When carrying out the round, it is important to check the affected geographical areas and to have a dialogue with the workers concerned in order to collect relevant information.

AFS 2020.1 The design of the workplace
AFS 1999.7 First aid and crisis support
AFS 2001.1 Systematic work environment work
AFS 2006.16 Notes
AFS 1996.5 Work at a monitor
AFS 2012.2 Load ergonomics
AFS 2010.4 Organizational and social work environment

Link to reference material
Not available for privacy reasons

Can be used within
The case company

Can be used in the following risk management types
Safety round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Checkpoint/Question</th>
<th>Obey</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational and social work environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The organizational and social work environment (OSA) is best managed in dialogue between manager/manager, manager/group and manager/ employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task distribution, offensive discrimination routine and tools for managers regarding OSA are available on the website that employees have access to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do employees experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 - that the indoor climate and air quality are functioning as they should?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>- that the lighting is satisfactory and that it can be adapted for the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>- that the lighting is flicker-free?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Checkpoint/Question</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>- that the noise level is satisfactory in the premises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>- that the noise level in the break room is acceptable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>- that the premises are orderly and tidy, and that the cleaning is functioning satisfactorily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>- that the routine for first aid and crisis support is known by all employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>- that there is a sufficient number of people with training in first aid?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>- that they know the location of the assembly point during evacuation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Screen and computer work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Checkpoint/Question</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Is computer work organized in a way that allows individuals to influence their own work pace and arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Do employees who work more than an hour a day at a computer screen receive regular eye examinations or when there is a need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Are employees offered, if necessary, so-called computer glasses at the employer's expense?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Do the users have the required training in software and equipment used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Checkpoint/Question</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Conditions for work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Do managers and supervisors have knowledge of how to prevent and deal with unhealthy workloads and abusive discrimination?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that there are opportunities for recovery?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Are there ways to report and detect signals of unhealthy workloads?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Is the work environment policy supplemented with goals for organizational and social work environment?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that the resources are adapted to the requirements?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that work content is clear and documented?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Do the employees perceive that the workplace is identified as free from strong psychological stress?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Do the employees perceive that the scheduling of working hours is free from health risks?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Are medical checks conducted for night shift work?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Is preventive action taken to address discriminatory treatment, and are there established procedures in place?</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Checkpoint/Question</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that they have been involved in the development of the goals regarding the organizational and social work environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Noise

4.1 Is there monitoring to ensure that particularly sensitive personnel are not exposed to unacceptable noise levels at work? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

4.2 Do the employees receive information and training regarding the risks of noise exposure when measurements equal to or exceed any of the lower guideline values? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

4.3 Are hearing tests performed on the employees working at levels equal to or exceeding the guidelines? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

Fire and Evacuation

5 Fire and Evacuation

5.1 Is the fire protection organization within the department updated and current? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

5.2 Has everyone who is part of the fire protection organization in the department received annual fire training? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

5.3 Is there an evacuation organization and is it known to all employees? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

5.4 Is the alarm routine known to all employees? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

5.5 Do all employees know the location of relevant alarm buttons in the area? |      |         |     |            | Eliminated |

Remote work

6 Remote work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Checkpoint/Question</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Are there functioning information and communication channels for employees about the company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Do managers have regular check-ins with employees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Do all employees have a plan for the work content in the short and long term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Do all employees have contact with colleagues during the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Do all employees have tasks where others are involved, e.g. through collaborations or as a sounding boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Do all employees feel that they have received sufficient information or training on how to work to avoid stress-related problems in the body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Are employees encouraged to seek variety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Do the employees take short movement breaks when working for a long time at the screen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that there is possibility of a break for e.g. movement, reflection or recovery between digital meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Do the employees feel that there is possibility to carry out digital walking meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Checkpoint/Question</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>When working remotely, is the ergonomic design of the computer workstation examined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Are there employees who have had pain or problems in connection with remote work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Are there other work environment aspects with working remotely that should also be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>During the check-ins between the manager and the employee, they talk about the employee's:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>- experience of working remotely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>- daily work routines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>- boundary between work and recovery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>- workload?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>- work performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>- any psychosocial problems, stress or mental health problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>- possible alcohol and drug-related abuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Checkpoint/Question</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Do all employees have the prerequisites they need to be able to perform:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>- tasks requiring concentration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>- creative tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When using digital tools for collaboration, video conferencing and chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Do the employees have sufficient technical competence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Can employees carry out their internal work with colleagues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Can the employees carry out their work with external customers and contacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The physical remote work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Do employees have access to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>- external screen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>- external keyboard and mouse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>- headset?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- office chair with adjustment options?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>Checkpunkt/Fråga</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Kommentar</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk efter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>- höj- och sänkbart bord?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Där arbetet utförs, finns det:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>- god allmänbelysning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>- god platsbelysning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>- möjlighet att skärma av dagsljus med gardiner eller persienn?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>- ingen besvärande bländning eller reflexer i skärm?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>- möjlighet att stänga ute eventuella störande ljud?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminerad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>